

28.2.152

15.3.2.14

AN

EXPOSITION OF THE CREED.

BY

JOHN PEARSON D.D. and Margaret Professor in
CAMBRIDGE,

And Chaplain to His MAJESTY.

The Third Edition, Revised and now more Enlarged;



L O N D O N,

Printed by J. F. for Job. Williams, and are to be sold by Richard Davis
of OXFORD, Anno Dom. 1669.



To Harvard College Library 1748

To the Right Worshipfull and Well-beloved,
The PARISHIONERS of
S^t. CLEMENTS
EAST-CHEAP.

Mercy unto you, and peace, and love be multiplied.



NOW I should be at any time unmindful of your commands, you might well esteem me unworthy of your continued favours; and there is some reason to suspect I have incurred the interpretation of forgetfulness, having been so backward in the performance of my promises. Some years have passed since I preached unto you upon such Texts of Scripture as were on purpose selected in relation to the CREED, and was moved by you to make those meditations publick. But you were pleased then to grant what my inclinations rather led me to, that they might be turned into an Exposition of the CREED it self: which partly by the difficulty of the Work undertaken, partly by the intervention of some other employments, hath taken me up thus long, for which I desire your pardon. And yet an happy excuse may be pleaded for my delay, meeting with a very great felicity, that as Faith triumpheth in good works, so my Exposition of the Creed should be contemporary with the reedifying of your Church. For though I can have little temptation to believe that my Book should last so long as that Fabrick; yet I am exceedingly pleased that they should begin together; that the publishing of the one should so agree with the opening of the other. This I hope may persuade you to forget my slackness, considering ye were not ready to your own expectation; your experience tells you the excuse of *Church-work* will be accepted in building, I beseech you let it not be denied in printing.

That blessed Saint, by whose name your Parish is known, was a fellow-labourer with *S. Paul*, and a successour of *S. Peter*; he had the honour to be numbred in the Scripture with them *whose names are written in the book of life*, and when he had sealed the Gospel with his blood, he was one of the first whose memory was perpetuated by the building a Church to bear his name. Thus was *S. Clements* Church

The Epistle Dedicatory.

famous in *Rome*, when *Rome* was famous for the *faith spoken of throughout the whole world*. He wrote an Epistle to the *Corinthians* infested with a schism, in imitation of *S. Paul*, which obtained so great authority in the Primitive times, that it was frequently read in their publick Congregations; and yet had for many hundred years been lost, till it was at last set forth out of the Library of the late King.

Now as by the providence of God, the memory of that Primitive Saint hath been restored in our age, so my design aimeth at nothing else but that the Primitive Faith may be revived. And therefore in this Edition of the Creed I shall speak to you but what *S. Jude* hath already spoken to the whole Church, *Beloved, when I gave all diligence to write unto you of the common salvation, it was needfull for me to write unto you, that ye should earnestly contend for the Faith which was once delivered to the Saints*. If it were so needful for him then to write, and for them to whom he wrote to contend for the first Faith, it will appear as needful for me now to follow his writing, and for you to imitate their earnestness, because the reason which he renders as the cause of that necessity is now more prevalent then it was at that time or ever since. *For, saith he, there are certain men crept in unawares, who were before of old ordained to this condemnation; ungodly men, turning the grace of God into lasciviousness, denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ*. The Principles of Christianity are now as freely questioned as the most doubtful and controverted points; the grounds of faith are as safely denied, as the most unnecessary superstructions; that Religion hath the greatest advantage which appeareth in the newest dress, as if we looked for another *Faith to be delivered to the Saints*. Whereas in Christianity there can be no concerning truth which is not ancient; and whatsoever is truly new is certainly false. Look then for purity in the fountain, and strive to embrace the first Faith, to w^{ch} you cannot have a more probable guide then the Creed, received in all ages of the Church; and to this I refer you, as it leads you to the Scriptures, from whence it was at first deduced, that while *those w^{ch} are unskilful and unstable wrest the words of God himself unto their own damnation*, ye may receive so much instruction as may set you beyond the imputation of unskilfulness, and so much of confirmation as may place you out of the danger of instability; which as it hath been the constant endeavour, so shall it ever be the prayer of him who after so many encouragements of his labours amongst you, doth still desire to be known as

Your most faithful Servant in the Lord

JOHN PEARSON.

TO

TO THE READER.



Have in this Book undertaken an Exposition of the Creed, and think it necessary in this Preface to give a brief Account of the Work: lest any should either expect to find that here which was never intended, or conceive that which they meet with such as they expected not.

The Creed without controversie is a brief comprehension of the objects of our Christian Faith, and is generally taken to contain all things necessary to be believed. Now whether all things necessary be contained there, concerneth not an Expositor to dispute, who is obliged to take notice of what is in it, but not to enquire into what is not: whether all truths comprehended in the same be of equal and absolute necessity, we are no way forced to declare; it being sufficient, as to the design of an Exposition, to interpret the words, and so deliver the sense, to demonstrate the truth of the sense delivered, and to manifest the proper necessity of each truth, how far, and in what degree, and to what purposes it is necessary.

This therefore is the Method which I proposed to myself; and have prosecuted in every Article. First, to settle the words of each Article according to their Antiquity and Generality of reception in the Creed. Secondly, to explicate and unfold the Terms, and to endeavour a right notion and conception of them as they are to be understood in the same. Thirdly, to shew what are those truths which are naturally contained in those terms so explicated, and to make it appear that they are truths indeed, by such arguments and reasons as are respectively proper to evidence the verity of them. Fourthly, to declare what is the Necessity of believing those Truths, what efficacy and influence they have in the soul and upon the life of a Believer. Lastly, by a recollection of all, briefly to deliver the sum of every particular truth, so that every one when he pronounceth the Creed may know what he ought to intend, and what he is understood to profess, when he so pronounceth it.

In the prosecution of the Whole according to this Method I have considered, that a Work of so general a concernment must be exposed to two kinds of Readers, which though they may agree in judgment, yet must differ much in their capacities. Some there are who understand the Original Languages of the Holy Scripture, the Discourses and Tractates of the ancient Fathers, the determinations of the Councils, and History of the Church of God, the constant profession of settled truths, the rise and encrease of Schisms and Heresies. Others there are unacquainted with such conceptions, and incapable of such instructions: who understand the Scriptures as they are translated: who are capable of the knowledge of the truths themselves, and of the proofs drawn from thence: who can apprehend the nature of the Christian faith with the power and efficacy of the same, when it is delivered unto them out of the Word of God, and in the language which they know. When I make this difference, and distinction of Readers: I do not intend thereby that, because one of these is Learned, the other is Ignorant; for he

To the Reader.

which hath no skill of the learned languages, may notwithstanding be very knowing in the principles of Christian Religion, and the reason and efficacie of them.

According to this distinction I have contrived my exposition, so that the Body of it containeth fully what can be delivered and made intelligible in the English Tongue, without inserting the least sentence or phrase of any learned Language, by which he which is not acquainted with it might be disturbed in his reading, or interrupted in his understanding. Not that I have selected onely such notions as are common, easie, and familiar of themselves, but have endeavoured to deliver the most material conceptions in the most plain and perspicuous manner; as desirous to comprize the whole strength of the Work, as far as it is possible, in the Body of it. The other Part I have placed in the Margin, (but so as oftentimes it taketh up more room, and yet is never mingled or confounded with the rest,) in which is contained whatsoever is necessary for the illustration of any part of the Creed, as to them which have any knowledge of the Latine, Greek, and Original Languages, of the writings of the ancient Fathers, the doctrines of the Jews, and the History of the Church, those great advantages toward a right perception of the Christian Religion.

Now being the Creed comprehendeth the principles of our Religion, it must contain those truths which belong unto it as it is a Religion, and those which concern it as it is ours. As it is a Religion, it delivereth such principles as are to be acknowledged in Natural Theology, such as no man which worshippeth a God can deny, and therefore in the proof of these I have made use of such arguments and reasons as are most proper to oppose the Atheists, who deny there is a God to be worshipped, a Religion to be professed. As it is our Religion, it is Christian and Catholick: as Christian, it containeth such truths as were delivered by Christ and his Apostles, and those especially concerning Christ himself, which I have prosecuted constantly with an eye to the Jews, who obstinately deny them, expecting still another Messias to come; wherefore I shew out of the Law and the Prophets which they acknowledge, what was foretold in every particular concerning the Messias, and prove all those to be completed by that Christ in whom we believe. As our Religion is Catholick, it holdeth fast that faith which was once delivered to the Saints, and since preserved in the Church; and therefore I expound such verities in opposition to the Hereticks arising in all ages, especially against the Photinians, who of all the rest have most perverted the Articles of our Creed, and found out followers in these latter ages, who have erected a new Body of Divinity in opposition to the Catholick Theology. Against these I proceed upon such principles as they themselves allow, that is upon the Word of God delivered in the Old and New Testament, alledged according to the true sense; and applied by right reason: not urging the Authority of the Church which they reject, but onely giving in the Margin the sense of the Primitive Fathers, for the satisfaction of such as have any respect left for Antiquity, and are persuaded that Christ had a true Church on the earth before these times.

In that part which after the demonstration of each Truth teacheth the necessity of the believing it, and the peculiar efficacy which it hath upon the life of a Christian; I have not thought fit to expatiate or enlarge my self, but onely to mention such effects as flow naturally and immediately from the doctrine, especially such as are delivered in the Scriptures; which I have endeavoured to set forth with all possible plainness and perspicuity. And indeed in the whole Work, as I have laid the foundation upon the written Word of God, so I have with much diligence collected such places of Scripture as are pertinent to each Doctrine, and with great faithfulness delivered them as they lie in the writings of those holy Pen-men; not referring the Reader to places named in the Margin, (which too often I find in many Books multiplyed to little purpose) but producing and interweaving the sentences

To the Reader.

tences of Scripture into the body of my Exposition, so that the Reader may understand the strength of all my reason without any farther enquiry or consultation. For if those words which I have produced, prove not what I have intended, I desire not any to think there is more in the places named to maintain it.

At the Conclusion of every distinct and several Notion, I have recollected briefly and plainly the sum of what hath been delivered in the explication of it, and put it, as it were, into the mouth of every Christian, thereby to express more fully his faith, and to declare his profession. So that if the Reader please to put those Collections together, he may at once see and perceive what he is in the whole obliged to believe, and what he is by the Church of God understood to profess, when he maketh this publick, ancient and Orthodox Confession of Faith.

I have nothing more to adde; but onely to pray that the Lord would give you and me a good understanding in all things.

THE

T H E
C R E E D.

I *Believe in God the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth; and in Jesus Christ, his onely Son our Lord, which was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead and buried, he descended into hell, the third day he rose again from the dead, he ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of God the Father Almighty: from thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead. I believe in the Holy Ghost, the holy Catholick Church, the communion of Saints, the forgiveness of sins, the Resurrection of the body, and the life everlasting.*



AN
EXPOSITION
OF THE
CREED.

ARTICLE I.

*I believe in God the Father Almighty, maker of
Heaven and Earth.*



THE first word *Credo, I believe*, giveth a denomination to the whole confession of Faith, from thence commonly call'd the *CREED*; so is the same word to be imagin'd not to stand onely where it is expressed, but to be carried through the whole body of the Confession. For although it be but twice actually rehearsed, yet must we conceive it virtually prefix'd to the head of every Article: that as we say, *I believe in God the Father Almighty*, so we are also understood to say, *I believe in Jesus Christ his onely Son, our Lord*; as, *I believe in the Holy Ghost*, so also, *I believe the Catholick Church*. Neither is it to be joyned with every compleat Article onely; but where any Article is not a single verity, but comprehensive, there it is to be look'd upon as affix'd to every part, or single truth, contained in that Article: as, for example, in the first, *I believe in God*, *I believe that God to be the Father*, *I believe that Father to be Almighty*, *I believe that Father Almighty to be the Maker of Heaven and Earth*. So that this *Credo, I believe*, rightly considered, multiplieth it self to no less then a double number of the Articles, and will be found at least 24 times contained in the *CREED*. Wherefore being a word so pregnant and diffusive, so necessary and essential to every part of our Confession of Faith, that without it we can neither have *CREED* nor Confession, it will require a more exact consideration, and more ample explication, and that in such a notion as is properly applicable to so many and so various Truths.

Now by this previous expression, *I believe*, thus considered, every parti-

But for the explication of the same, farther observations will be necessary. For if that which we believe be something which is credible, and the notion under which we believe be the Credibility of it, then must we first declare what it is to be *Credible*, and in what *Credibility* doth consist, before we can understand what is the nature of *Belief*.

Now that is properly *Credible* which is not apparent of it self, nor certainly to be collected, either antecedently by its cause, or reversely by its effect, and yet, though by none of these ways, hath the attestation of a truth. For those things which are apparent of themselves, are either so in respect of our Sense, as that Snow is white, and Fire is hot; or in respect of our Understanding, as that the whole of any thing is greater then any one part of the whole, that every thing imaginable either is, or is not. The first kind of which being propounded to our sense, one to the sight, the other to the touch, appear of themselves immediately true, and therefore are not termed *Credible*, but *evident* to sense; as the latter kind, propounded to the understanding, are immediately embraced and acknowledged as truths apparent in themselves, and therefore are not called *Credible*, but *evident* to the understanding. And so those things which are * apparent, are not said properly to be believed, but to be known.

Again, other things, though not immediately apparent in themselves, may yet appear most certain and evidently true, by an immediate and necessary connexion with something formerly known. For being every natural cause actually applied doth necessarily produce its own natural effect, and every natural effect wholly dependeth upon, and absolutely presupposeth, its own proper cause; therefore there must be an immediate connexion between the cause and its effect. From whence it follows that, if the connexion be once clearly perceived, the effect will be known in the cause, and the cause by the effect. And by these ways, proceeding from principles evidently known by consequences certainly concluding, we come to the knowledge of propositions in Mathematicks, and conclusions in other Sciences: which propositions and conclusions are not said to be *Credible*, but *Scientifical*; and the comprehension of them is not *Faith*, but *Science*.

Besides, some things there are which, though not evident of themselves, nor seen by any necessary connexion to their causes or effects, notwithstanding appear to most as true by some external relations to other truths; but yet so, as the appearing truth still leaves a possibility of falshood with it, and therefore doth but incline to an *Assent*. In which case whatsoever is thus apprehended, if it depend upon real Arguments, is not yet call'd *Credible*, but *Probable*: and an Assent to such a Truth is not properly *Faith*, but *Opinion*.

But when any thing propounded to us is neither apparent to our sense, nor evident to our understanding, in and of it self, neither certainly to be collected from any clear and necessary connexion with the cause from which it proceedeth, or the effects which it naturally produceth, nor is taken up upon any real Arguments or reference to other acknowledged Truths, and yet notwithstanding appeareth to us true, not by a manifestation, but attestation of the truth, and so moveth us to assent not of it self, but by virtue of the testimony given to it; this is said † properly to be *Credible*; and an *Assent* unto this, upon such *Credibility*, is in the proper notion *Faith* or *Belief*.

Having thus defined and illustrated the nature of *Faith* in general, so far as it agreeth to all kinds of belief whatsoever; our method will lead us on to descend by way of division to the several kinds thereof, till at last we come to the proper notion of *Faith* in the Christians *Confession*, the design of our present disquisition. And being we have placed the formality of the Object of all

* Apparentia non habent fidem, sed agnitionem. Greg. 4: Dial. cap. 5. Haber Fides oculos suos quibus quodammodo videt verum esse quod nondum videt, & quibus certissime videt nondum se videre quod credit. S. August. Ep. 222:

† Aristot. Probl. 18. 3. ai dia ti parrhsion parrhsion.

belief in *Credibility*, it will clearly follow, that diversity of *Credibility* in the Object will proportionably cause a distinction of *Assent* in the Understanding, and consequently a several kind of *Faith*, which we have supposed to be nothing else but such an *Assent*.

Now the *Credibility* of Objects, by which they appear fit to be believed, is distinguishable according to the diversities of its foundation, that is, according to the different *Authority* of the *Testimony* on which it depends. For we having no other certain means of assuring our selves of the truth, and consequently no other motives of our *Assent* in matters of mere *Belief*, then the *Testimony* upon which we believe; if there be any fundamental distinction in the *Authority* of the *Testimony*, it will cause the like difference in the *Assent*, which must needs bear a proportion to the *Authority* of the *Testimony*, as being originally and essentially founded upon it. It is therefore necessary next to consider in what the *Authority* of a *Testimony* consisteth, and so to descend to the several kinds of *Testimonies* founded upon several *Authorities*.

The strength and validity of every *Testimony* must bear proportion with the * *Authority* of the *Testifier*; and the *Authority* of the *Testifier* is founded upon his *Ability* and *Integrity*: his *Ability* in the knowledge of that which he delivereth and asserteth, his *Integrity* in delivering and asserting according to his knowledge. For two several ways he which relateth or testifieth any thing may deceive us; one, by being ignorant of the truth, and so upon that ignorance mistaking, he may think that to be true which is not so, and consequently deliver that for truth which in it self is false, and so deceive himself and us; or if he be not ignorant, yet if he be dishonest or unfaithfull, that which he knows to be false he may propound and assert to be a truth, and so though himself be not deceived, he may deceive us. And by each of these ways, for want either of *Ability* or *Integrity* in the *Testifier*, whoso grounds his *Assent* unto any thing as a truth upon the testimony of another, may equally be deceived.

But whosoever is so *able* as certainly to know the truth of that which he delivereth, and so *faithfull* as to deliver nothing but what and as he knoweth, he, as he is not deceived, so deceiveth no man. So far therefore as any person testifying appeareth to be knowing of the thing he testifies, and to be faithfull in the relation of what he knows, so far his testimony is acceptable, so far that which he testifieth is properly *Credible*. And thus the *Authority* of every *Testifier* or relatour is grounded upon these two foundations, his *Ability* and *Integrity*.

Now there is in this case, so far as it concerns our present design, † a double *Testimony*: the *Testimony* of man to man, relying upon humane authority; and the *Testimony* of God to man, founded upon Divine authority: which two kinds of *Testimony* are respective grounds of two kinds of *Credibility*, *Humane* and *Divine*; and consequently there is a two-fold *Faith* distinguish'd by this double object, a *Humane* and a *Divine Faith*.

Humane Faith is an *Assent* unto any thing *Credible* merely upon the *testimony of man*. Such is the belief we have of the words and affections one of another. And upon this kind of Faith we proceed in the ordinary affairs of our life; according to the opinion we have of the ability and fidelity of him which relates or asserts any thing we believe or disbelieve. By this a friend assureth himself of the affection of his friend: by this the * son acknowledgeth his father, and upon this is his obedience wrought. By virtue of this *Humane Faith* it is that we doubt not at all of those things which we never saw, by reason of their distance from us, either by time or place. Who doubts whether there be such a Countrey as *Italy*, or such a City as *Constantinople*, though he never pass'd

* Τὸ γὰρ πᾶν μα-
κάρεδς τὸν
ἀέτιον, π-
σεύομαι ὅτι
δὲ δὲν, ἀν-
ἀγαδὸς πα-
ντὸς ὁ δὲν
ἢ ἀμφο. A-
ristot. Rhet.

lib. 1. cap. 8.
† Testimoni-
orum quæ
sunt genera?
Divinum &
Humanum.
Divinum, ut
oracula, ut
auspicia, ut
vaticination-
es, & re-
sponsa sacer-
dotum, aru-
spicum, con-
jectorum:
Humanum,
quod spectat-
ur ex autho-
ritate, & ex
voluntate, &
ex oratione
aut libera aut
expressa; in
quo insunt
scripta, pacta,
promissa, ju-
rata, quaesita.
Cicero Orat.
Partit.

* Non dicant
non credimus
quia non vi-
dimus; quo-
niam si hæc
dicant, co-
guntur fateri
incertos sibi
esse parentes
suos. De fide
rerum invi-
sib. amongst
the works of
S. Augustin.
Αὐτὸν δὲ ὁ
θεὸς οἶδε ὅτι
πατὴρ ἐξέγενετο.
Ἀλλ' ὡς νο-
μίζομεν πατέρας,
ἢ μητέρας.
Menander
apud Stob.

pass'd any of our four seas? Who questions now whether there were such a man as *Alexander* in the East, or *Cæsar* in the West? and yet the latest of these hath been beyond the possibility of the knowledge of man these sixteen hundred years. There is no * Science taught without original belief, there are no † letters learnt without preceding faith. There is no Justice executed, no commerce maintained, no business prosecuted without this; * all secular affairs are transacted, all great achievements attempted, all hopes, desires and inclinations are preserved by this Humane Faith grounded upon the Testimony of man.

In which case we all by easie experience may observe the nature, generation and progress of *Belief*. For in any thing which belongeth to more then ordinary knowledge, we believe not him whom we think to be ignorant, nor do we assent the more for his assertion, though never so confidently delivered: but if we have a strong opinion of the knowledge and skill of any person, what he affirmeth within the compass of his knowledge that we readily assent unto; and while we have no other ground but his affirmation, this *Assent* is properly *Belief*. Whereas if it be any matter of concernment in which the interest of him that relateth or affirmeth any thing to us is considerable, there it is not the skill or knowledge of the relatour which will satisfie us, except we have as strong an opinion of his fidelity and integrity: but if we think him so just and honest, that he hath no design upon us, nor will affirm any thing contrary to his knowledge for any gain or advantage, then we readily assent unto his affirmations; and this *Assent* is our *Belief*. Seeing then our *Belief* relies upon the ability and integrity of the Relatour, and being the knowledge of all men is imperfect, and the hearts of all men are deceitful, and so their integrity to be suspected, there can be no infallible universal ground of *Humane Faith*.

But what satisfaction we cannot find in the testimony of man, we may receive in the testimony of God. † *If we receive the witness of man, the witness of God is greater.* Yea, let God be true, the ground of our *Divine*, and every man a liar, the ground of our *Humane Faith*.

As for the other member of the Division, we may now plainly perceive that it is thus to be defined; *Divine Faith is an Assent unto something as Credible upon the Testimony of God.* This *Assent* is the highest kind of *Faith*, because the object hath the highest *Credibility*, because grounded upon the *Testimony of God*, which is *Infallible*. *Balaam* could tell *Balak* thus much, *a God is not a man, that he should lie*; and a better Prophet confirm'd the same truth to *Saul*, *The strength of Israel will not lie*; and because he will not, because he cannot, he is the strength of *Israel*, even *my God, my strength, in whom I will trust*.

For first, God is of infinite knowledge and wisdom, as *Hannah* hath taught us, *the Lord is a God of knowledge*, or rather, if our language will bear it, of *knowledges*, which are so plural, or rather infinite in their plurality, that the Psalmist hath said, *Of his understanding there is no number.* He knoweth therefore all things, neither can any truth be hid from his knowledge, who is essentially truth and essentially knowledge, and, as so, the cause of all other truth and knowledge. Thus the understanding of God is infinite in respect of * comprehension, and not so onely, but of certainty also and evidence. Some things we are said to know which are but obscurely known, we see them but as in a glass, or through a cloud: But *a God is light; and in him is no darkness at all*: he seeth without any obscurity, and whatsoever is propounded to his Understanding is most clear and evident; *neither is there any creature that is*

formiter multiformis, incomprehensibili comprehensione omnia incomprehensibilia comprehendit. S. Augustinus de Civitate Dei, lib. 12. cap. 18. ^a 1 Job. 1. 5. ^c Heb. 4. 13.

* ἡ ἀποκαλύψις
μὴν τοῦ καὶ κρυ-
πτῆς τῆς ἐπισ-
τήμης ἢ πίστεως.
Theodor. The-
rap. 1.
† Οὐδὲ γὰρ τὰ
ἀποκρυφτά σοφί-
α καὶ μαθεῖν
οἶόν τε μὴ
πρὸ γαστρίμα-
κτος πέμψου-
ντά. ibid.
* Πάντα τὰ
ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ
τελεῖσθαι, καὶ
τὰ ἐκ τῶν ὀφ-
θάλμων τῆς
ἐκκλησίας τῆς
ἀπείρου τελευ-
τῆς. Cyril. Catech.
V. Orig. cont.
Celsum, lib. 1.
Eus. de Prep.
Evang. 1. l.
c. 5.
Ambr. ad ver.
Gent. 1. 2.
† 1 John 5. 9.
Rom. 3. 4.
Quam indi-
gnum, ut hu-
manis testi-
monio de a-
lio credamus,
Dei oraculis
de se non cre-
damus! S.
Ambr. l. de
Abraham. c. 3.
Πᾶς δ' ἐκ
ἐπιλογισμῶν
πάντων ὅτι
ἀνθρώπων
πίστεως ὑπερ-
βάλλον ἐκεί-
νων, μᾶλλον
πιστεύειν τῷ
θεῷ; Orig. ad
Cels. 1. 1.
^a Num. 23.
19.
1 Sam. 15.
29.
Psal. 18. 2.
^b 1 Sam. 2. 3.
אֵל הַיּוֹד
לְהוֹדוֹת
Lxx. Θεὸς
γινώσκων καὶ
ἐκτελέων.
^c Psal. 147.
5. in the Heb.
לְהוֹדוֹת
אֵין מַסְפֵּר
^a Cujus sapi-
entia simpli-
citer multi-
plex, & uni-

not manifest in his sight; but all things are naked and opened unto the eyes of him with whom we have to doe. Wherefore being all things are within the compass of his knowledge, being all things which are so are most clear and evident unto him, being the knowledge he hath of them is most certain and infallible, it inevitably followeth that he cannot be deceiv'd in any thing.

Secondly, the justice of God is equal to his knowledge, nor is his holiness inferiour to his wisdom: a God of truth, faith Moses, and without iniquity, just and right is he. From which internall, essential and infinite rectitude, goodness and holiness, followeth an impossibility to declare or deliver that for truth which he knoweth not to be true. For if it be against that finite purity and integrity which is required of man, to lie, and therefore sinfull, then must we conceive it absolutely inconsistent with that transcendent purity and infinite integrity which is essential unto God. Although therefore the power of God be infinite, though he can doe all things; yet we may safely say, without any * prejudice to his Omnipotency, that he † cannot speak that for truth which he knoweth to be otherwise. For the perfections of his will are as necessarily infinite as those of his understanding; neither can he be unholy or unjust more then he can be ignorant or unwise. ^a If we believe not, yet he abideth faithfull, he cannot deny himself. Which words of the Apostle, though properly belonging to the promises of God, yet are as true in respect of his assertions; neither should he more deny himself in violating his fidelity, then in contradicting his veracity. 'Tis true, that ^b God willing more abundantly to shew unto the Heirs of promise the immutability of his counsel, confirmed it by an oath; that by two immutable things, in which it was impossible for God to lie, we might have a strong consolation: but 'tis as true, that all this confirmation is onely for our consolation; otherwise it is as impossible for God to lie without an oath, as with one; for being he can ^c swear by no greater, he sweareth onely by himself, and so the strength even of the Oath of God relieth upon the Veracity of God. Wherefore being God as God is of infinite rectitude, goodness and holiness, being it is manifestly repugnant to his purity, and inconsistent with his integrity, to deliver any thing contrary to his knowledge, it clearly followeth that he cannot deceive any man.

It is therefore most infallibly certain, that God, being infinitely wise, cannot * be deceived; being infinitely good, cannot † deceive: and upon these two immovable pillars standeth the Authority of the Testimony of God. For since we cannot doubt of the witness of any one, but by questioning his ability, as one who may be ignorant of that which he affirmeth, and so deceived; or by excepting against his integrity, as one who may affirm that which he knoweth to be false, and so have a purpose to deceive us: where there is no place for either of these exceptions, there can be no doubt of the truth of the Testimony. But where there is an intrinsecall * repugnancy of being deceived in the Understanding, and of deceiving in the Will, as there certainly is in the understanding and will of God, there can be no place for either of those exceptions, and consequently there can be no doubt of the truth of that which God testifieth. And whosoever thinketh any thing comes from him, and assenteth not unto it, must necessarily deny him to be wise or holy: ^d He that believeth not God, saith the Apostle, hath made him a liar. That truth then which is testified by God, hath a Divine Credibility: and an Assent unto it as so Credibile, is Divine Faith. In which the material Object is the Doctrine which God delivereth, the formal Object is that Credibility founded on the † Authority of the deliverer. And this I conceive the true nature of Divine Faith in general.

† Deut. 32. 4.
Διωκται
καὶ ἡμᾶς
πάντα ὁ θεός,
ὁπότε δυνά-
μει ὁ, ὅς
θεός ἐστι, καὶ
ἀγαθός ἐστι,
καὶ σοφός ἐστι,
καὶ ἐξ ἑστάρη.
Orig. contra
Celsum.

† Si velint in-
venire quod
omnipotens
non potest,
habent pro-
fus, ego di-
cam, mentiri
non potest.
S. August. de
Civ. Dei. l. 22.
c. 25.
^a 2 Tim. 2.
13.

Heb. 6.
17, 18.
^c Heb. 6. 13.

* Ut sit om-
nium po-
tens, mori
non potest,
falli non po-
test, mentiri
non potest.
August. de
Symb. ad Ca-
techum.

† Deus facere
fraudem ne-
scit, pari non
potest. Chry-
sol. Serm. 62.
* Autoritas
Dei consistit
in intrinseca
repugnantia
deceptionis
seu falsitatis
quam habet
divinum ju-
diciū, & in
intrinseca re-
pugnantia
actus volun-
tatis impe-
rantis testi-
monium ex-
trinsecum
non consen-
tiens iudicio
interno;
quæ per ter-
minos positi-
vos actus in-
tellectus in-
fallibiliter
veri, & actus
voluntatis intrinsece & necessariò recti, poterit explicari. Francisc. de Oratio Tract. de Fide Contr. 2. p. 2. ^d 1 Job. 5. 10.

† Divina est Auctoritas cui credimus; divina est doctrina quam sequimur. Leo, Serm. 7. in Nativ.

Now

Now being the *Credibility* of all which we *believe* is founded upon the *Testimony* of God, we can never be sufficiently instructed in the notion of *Faith*, till we first understand how this testimony is given to those truths which we now believe. To which end it will be necessary to give notice that the *Testimony* of God is not given unto truths before questioned or debated; nor are they such things as are first propounded and doubted of by man, and then resolved and confirm'd by interposing the authority of God: but he is then said to witness when he doth propound, and his *testimony* is given by way of *Revelation*, which is nothing else but the delivery or speech of God unto his Creatures. And therefore upon a diversity of delivery must follow a difference, though not of *Faith* it self, yet of the means and manner of *Assent*.

Wherefore it will be farther necessary to observe, that divine *Revelation* is of two kinds, either Immediate, or Mediate. An Immediate *Revelation* is that by which God delivereth himself to man by himself without the intervention of man. A Mediate *Revelation* is the conveyance of the counsel of God unto man by man. By the first he spake unto the Prophets; by the second in the Prophets, and by them unto us. Being then there is this difference between the revealing of God unto the Prophets and to others, being the Faith both of Prophets and others relieth wholly upon divine *Revelation*, the * difference of the manner of *Assent* in these several kinds of Believers will be very observable for the explanation of the nature of our *Faith*.

tis & Apostolis factis: alia est quæ oritur in aliquibus per spiritualem locutionem, quâ Deus aliquibus per internam inspirationem credenda revelat, nullo hominis ministerio utens; sicut est fides Apostolorum & Prophetarum, qui ab ipso Deo per intrinsecam illuminationem sunt de credendis instructi. *Francisc. Ferrariensis in Thom. cont. Gent. cap. 40.*

Those then to whom God did immediately speak himself, or by an angel representing God, and so being in his stead, and bearing his name, (of which I shall need here to make no distinction) those persons, I say, to whom God did so reveal himself, did by virtue of the same *Revelation* perceive, know, and assure themselves that he which spake to them was God; so that at the same time they clearly understood both what was delivered, and by whom: otherwise we cannot imagine that *Abraham* would have slain his son, or have been commended for such a resolution, had he not been most assured that it was God who by an immediate *Revelation* of his will clearly commanded it. ^a Thus by faith *Noah* being warned of God of things not seen as yet, moved with fear, prepared an Ark, to the saving of his house: which * warning of God was a clear *Revelation* of God's determination to drown the world, of his will to save him and his family, and of his command for that end to build an Ark. And this *Noah* so received from God, as that he knew it to be an oracle of God, and was as well assured of the Authour, as informed of the command. Thus the judgements hanging over *Judah* were revealed in the ears of ^b *Isaiah* by the Lord of hosts. Thus ^c the Lord revealed himself to *Samuel* in *Shiloh*: at first indeed he knew him not; that is, when the Lord spake, he knew it not to be the voice of God, ^d Now *Samuel* did not yet know the Lord, neither was the word of the Lord yet revealed unto him; but after that he knew him, and was assured that it was He which spake unto him, the Scripture teaching us that the † ears of *Samuel* were revealed, and the * word of God revealed, and † God himself revealed to him. By all which we can understand no less, then that *Samuel* was so illuminated in his prophecies, that he fully understood the words or things themselves which were delivered, and as certainly knew that the deliverer was God: so *Samuel* the Seer, so the rest of the Prophets believed those truths revealed to them by such a Faith as was a firm Assent unto an object credible upon the immediate Testimony of God.

* Sicut duplex est auditus & locutio, scilicet exterior sive corporalis, & interior ac spiritualis; ita duplex est fides, una quæ oritur in cordibus fidelium per auditum exteriorum, cum scilicet Deus per aliquos homines aliis credenda proponit; & ista est fides quæ nobis sive communi statui fidelium convenit, ex eo quod adhaeremus revelationibus Prophetarum.

^a Heb. 11. 7. * ἡσκησεν μαθηματικῶς, which word comes from the original ἡσκησεν, appropriated by the Greeks to an Oracle, or answer given by God, ὁ ἀπὸ θεοῦ ἡσκησεν, ὁ δὲ ἄνθρωπος μαθηματικῶς, Moschopolus. ^b Is. 22. 14. ^c 1 Sam. 3. 21. ^d 1 Sam. 3. 7. ^e יְהוָה גִּלְיָה אֶת אֹן שְׁמוֹאֵל ^f κῶλυθ' ἀπεκάλυψε τὸ ὄνομα Σαμουὴλ, 1 Sam. 9. 15. * טָרַם ^g וְגִלְיָה אֵלָיו דְּבַר יְהוָה ^h πῶς ἢ καταλαβόντων αὐτὸς ἑῷα κῶλυθ', 1 Sam. 3. 7. ⁱ נִגְלָה ^j דְּבַר יְהוָה ^k שְׁמוֹאֵל

ἐπεκαλεσθῆναι κῶλυθ' ὅτι Σαμουὴλ, 1 Sam. 3. 21.

But

But those faithfull people to whom the Prophets spake believed the same truth, and upon the testimony of the same God, delivered unto them not by God, but by those Prophets, whose words they therefore assented unto as certain truths, because they were assured that what the Prophets spake was immediately revealed to them by God himself, without which assurance no faith could be expected from them. When God appeared unto Moses in a flame of fire out of the midst of a bush, and there immediately revealed to him first himself, saying, *I am the God of thy Fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob*, and then his will, to bring the children of Israel out of the land of Egypt, Moses clearly believed God both in the Revelation of himself and of his will, and was fully satisfied that the Israelites should be delivered, because he was assured it was God who promised their deliverance: yet notwithstanding still he doubted whether the Israelites would believe the same truth, when it should be delivered to them, not immediately by God, but by Moses, And Moses answered and said, *But behold they will not believe me, nor hearken unto my voice; for they will say, The Lord hath not appeared unto thee.* Which words of his first suppose, that if they had heard the voice of God, as he had, they would have assented to the truth upon a testimony divine; and then as rationally affirm, that it was improbable they should believe, except they were assured it was God who promised, or think that God had promised by Moses, onely because Moses said so. Which rational objection was clearly taken away when God endued Moses with power of evident and undoubted miracles; for then the Rod which he carried in his hand was as infallible a sign to the Israelites that God had appeared unto him, as the flaming Bush was to himself; and therefore they which saw in his hand God's Omnipotency, could not suspect in his tongue God's Veracity; insomuch as when Aaron became to Moses in stead of a Mouth, and Moses to Aaron in stead of God, Aaron spake all the words which the Lord had spoken unto Moses, and did the signs in the sight of the people, and the people believed. For being perswaded by a lively and active presence of Omnipotency that God had appeared unto Moses, and what was delivered to them by him came to him from God, and being sufficiently assured out of the very sense and notion of a Deity, that whatsoever God should speak must of necessity be true, they presently assented, and believed the Lord and his Servant Moses; Moses, as the immediate propounder, God, as the original revealer: they believed Moses that God had revealed it, and they believed the promise because God had revealed it. So that the Faith both of Moses and the Israelites was grounded upon the same testimony or revelation of God, and differed onely in the proposition or application of the testimony; Moses receiving it immediately from God himself, the Israelites mediately by the ministry of Moses.

In the like manner the succeeding Prophets were the instruments of divine Revelation, which they first believed as revealed to them, and then the people as revealed by them: for what they delivered was not the testimony of man, but the testimony of God delivered by man. It was he who spake by the mouth of his holy Prophets which have been since the world began: the mouth, the instrument, the articulation was theirs; but the words were God's. The Spirit of the Lord spake by me, saith David, and his word was in my tongue. It was the word of the Lord, which he spake by the hand of Moses, and by the hand of his Servant Ahijah the Prophet. The hand the general instrument of man, the mouth the particular instrument of speech, both attributed to the Prophets as merely instrumental in their prophecies. The words which Balaam's asse spake were as much the asse's words, as those which Balaam spake were his; for the Lord opened the mouth of the asse, and the Lord put a word in

Exod. 3. 2.

Exod. 4. 1.

Exod. 4. 16.

Exod. 4. 30,
31.

Exod. 14. 31.

Luke 1. 70.

2 Sam. 23. 2.

1 King. 8. 53.

1 King. 14. 18.

Numb. 22. 28.

Numb. 23. 5.

in Balaam's mouth; and not onely so, but a bridle with that word, *onely the word* Numb. 22. 35. *that I shall speak unto thee, that thou shalt speak.* The Prophets, as they did not frame the notions or conceptions themselves of those truths which they delivered from God, so did they not loosen their own tongues of their own instinct or upon their own motion, but as moved, impelled, and acted by God. So we may in correspondence to the antecedent and subsequent words interpret those words of S. Peter, that *no Prophecy of the Scripture is of any * private interpretation* : that is, that no Prophecy which is written did so proceed from the Prophet which spake or wrote it, that he of himself or by his own instinct did open his mouth to prophesie; but that all propheticall Revelations came from God alone, and that whosoever first delivered them was antecedently inspired by him, as it followeth, *for the Prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the holy Ghost.* That therefore which they delivered was the word, the Revelation of God; which they assented unto as to a certain and infallible truth, credible upon the immediate testimony of God, and to which the rest of the Believers assented upon the same testimony of God mediately delivered by the hands of the Prophets.

Thus God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in times past unto the Fathers by the Prophets, and by so speaking propounded the Object of Faith both to the Prophets and the Fathers, *hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son,* and by so speaking hath enlarged the Object of Faith to us by him, by which means it comes to be the Faith of Jesus. Thus the *onely-begotten Son, who was in the bosome of the Father, the expresse image of his person,* he in whom it pleased the Father that all fulness should dwell, he in whom dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily, revealed the will of God to the Apostles, who being assured that he *knew all things,* and convinced that he came forth from God, gave a full and clear assent unto those things which he delivered, and grounded their Faith upon his words as upon the immediate testimony of God. *I have given unto them,* saith Christ unto his Father, *the words which thou gavest me, and they have received them, and have known surely that I came out from thee, and they have believed that thou didst send me.* Beside this delivery of these words by Christ to the Apostles, they received the promise of the Spirit of truth, which should *guide them into all truth, and teach them all things, and bring all things into their remembrance whatsoever Christ had said unto them.* So clearly, so fully, so constantly were they furnished with divine illuminations and revelations from God, upon which they grounded their own Faith; that each of them might well make that profession of S. Paul, *I know whom I have believed.* Thus the Faith of the Apostles, as of Moses and the Prophets, was grounded upon the immediate Revelations of God. Heb. 1. 1. Vers. 2. Rev. 14. 12. John 1. 13. Heb. 1. 3. Col. 1. 19. Col. 2. 9. John 16. 30. John 17. 8. John 16. 13. John 14. 26. 2 Tim. 1. 13.

But those Believers to whom the Apostles preached, and whom they converted to the Faith, believed the same truths which were revealed to the Apostles, though they were not so revealed to them as they were unto the Apostles, that is, immediately from God. But as the Israelites believed those truths which Moses spake, to come from God, being convinced by the constant supply of miracles wrought by the Rod which he carried in his hand: so the blessed Apostles, being so plentifully endued from above with the power of Miracles, gave sufficient testimony that it was God which spake by their mouths, who so evidently wrought by their hands. They which heard S. Peter call a lame man unto his legs, speak a dead man alive, and strike a living man to death with his tongue, as he did Ananias and Sapphira, might easily be persuaded that it was God who spake by his mouth, and conclude that where they found him in his Omnipotency, they might well expect him in his Ver-

racity. These were the persons for whom our Saviour next to the Apostles prayed, because by a way next to that of the Apostles they believed. *Neither pray I for these alone, saith Christ, but for them also who shall believe on me through their word.* Thus the Apostles believed on *Christ* through his own word, and the primitive Christians believed on the same *Christ* through the Apostles word: and this distinction our Saviour himself hath clearly made; not that the word of the Apostles was really distinct from the word of *Christ*, but one-ly it was called theirs, because delivered by their ministry, otherwise it was the same word which they had heard from him, and upon which they themselves believed. *That which was from the beginning,* saith S. John, *which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled of the word of life, That which we have seen and heard, declare we unto you.* And this was the true foundation of Faith in all them which believed, that they took not the words which they heard from the Apostles to be the words of the men which spake them, no more then they did the power of healing the sick, or raising the dead, and the rest of the miracles, to be the power of them that wrought them; but as they attributed those miraculous works to God working by them, so did they also that saving word to the same God speaking by them. When S. Paul preached at *Antioch*, almost the whole city came together to hear the word of God; so they esteemed it, though they knew him a man whom they came to hear speak it. This the Apostle commendeth in the *Thessalonians*, that when they received the word of God, which they heard of him, they received it not as the word of man, but (as it is in truth,) the word of God; and receiving it so, they embraced it as coming from him who could neither deceive nor be deceived, and consequently as infallibly true; and by so embracing it they assented unto it, by so assenting to it they believed it, ultimately upon the testimony of God, immediately upon the testimony of S. Paul, as he speaks himself, *because our testimony among you was believed.* Thus the Faith of those which were converted by the Apostles was an Assent unto the word as credible upon the testimony of God, delivered to them by a testimony Apostolicall. Which being thus clearly stated, we may at last descend into our own condition, and so describe the nature of our own Faith, that every one may know what it is to Believe.

Although *Moses* was endued with the power of miracles, and conversed with God in the Mount, and spake with him face to face at the door of the Tabernacle; although upon these grounds the *Israelites* believed what he delivered to them as the word of God; yet neither the Miracles nor *Moses* did for ever continue with them; and notwithstanding his death, they and their posterity to all generations were obliged to believe the same truths. Wherefore it is observable which S. Stephen saith, *he received the lively oracles to give unto them*; the Decalogue he received from the hand of God, written with the finger of God, the rest of the divine patefactions he wrote himself; and so delivered them not a mortal word to die with him, but *living oracles*, to be in force when he was dead, and oblige the people to a belief, when his Rod had ceas'd to broach the Rocks and divide the Seas. Neither did he onely tie them to a belief of what he wrote himself, but by foretelling and describing the Prophets which should be raised in future Ages, he put a farther obligation upon them to believe their prophecies as the revelations of the same God. Thus all the *Israelites* in all Ages believed *Moses*, while he lived, by believing his words; after his death, by believing his writings. *Had ye believed Moses,* saith our Saviour, *ye would have believed me; for he wrote of me. But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?* Wherefore the Faith of the *Israelites* in the land of *Canaan* was an Assent unto the truths of the

Law

Law as credible upon the testimony of God delivered unto them in the writings of Moses and the Prophets.

In the like manner is it now with us. For although *Christ* first published the Gospel to those who beheld his glory, the glory as of the only-begotten of the Father; although the Apostles first converted those unto the Faith who heard them speak with Tongues they never learn'd, they never heard before, and discover the thoughts of men they never saw before, who saw the lame to walk, the blind to see, the dead to revive, and the living to expire at their command: yet did not these Apostles prolong their lives by virtue of that power which gave such testimony to their doctrine, but rather shortned them by their constant attestation to the truth of that doctrine farther confirmed by their death. Nor did that power of frequent and ordinary miraculous operations long survive them; and yet they left as great an obligation upon the Church in all succeeding Ages to believe all the truths which they delivered, as they had put upon those persons who heard their words and saw their works; because they wrote the same truths which they spake, assisted in writing by the same Spirit by which they spake, and therefore require the same readiness of assent so long as the same truths shall be preserved by those writings. While *Moses* lived and spake as a Mediatour between God and the Israelites, they believed his words, and so the Prophets while they preached. When *Moses* was gone up to Mount *Nebo*, and there died, when the rest of the Prophets were gathered to their fathers, they believed their writings, and the whole object of their Faith was contained in them. When the Son of God came into the world to reveal the will of his Father, when he made known unto the Apostles, as his friends, all things that he had heard of the Father, then did the Apostles believe the writings of *Moses* and the Prophets, and the words of *Christ*; and in these taken together was contained the entire object of their Faith, and they believed the Scripture, and the word which *Jesus* had said. When *Christ* was ascended up into heaven, and the Holy Ghost come down, when the words which *Christ* had taught the Apostles were preached by them, and many thousand Souls converted to the Faith, they believed the writings of the Prophets and the words of the Apostles; and in these two was comprised the compleat object of their Faith. When the Apostles themselves departed out of this life, and confirmed the truth of the Gospel preached by the last of sufferings, their death, they left the summe of what they had received, in writing, for the continuation of the Faith in the Churches which they had planted, and the propagation thereof in other places, by those which succeeded them in their ordinary function, but were not to come near them in their extraordinary gifts. ^a *These things were written*, saith *S. John*, the longest liver and the latest writer, *that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing ye might have life through his name.*

Those Christians then which have lived since the Apostles death, and never obtain'd the wish of *S. Augustine*, to see either *Christ* upon earth or *S. Paul* in the Pulpit, have believed the writings of *Moses* and the Prophets, of the Apostles and Evangelists, in which together is fully comprehended whatsoever may properly be termed matter of divine Faith; and so ^b *the household of God is built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets*, who are continued unto us onely in their writings, and by them alone convey unto us the truths which they received from God, upon whose testimony we believe. And therefore he which put their writings into the definition of Faith, considering Faith as now it stands with us, is none of the smallest of the * Schoolmen. From whence we may at last conclude, that the true nature of the Faith of a

Job. 1. 14.

Job. 15. 15.

Job. 2. 22.

^a Job. 20. 31.^b Eph. 2. 20.

Prophetæ & Apostoli, super quos omnium Ecclesiarum fundamenta locantur. S. Hieron. in Psal. 17.

Super Prophetas ædificatur orbis terrarum credens in Domino. Ruff. ib.

* Dward. l. 3.

Dist. 24. q. 1.

S. 9. Fides

est habitus

quo assenti-

mus dictis

Scripturæ

propter au-

thoritatem

Dei revelan-

tis.

Christian, as the state of *Christ's* Church now stands and shall continue to the end of the world, consists in this, that it is an *Assent unto truths credible upon the testimony of God delivered unto us in the writings of the Apostles and Prophets.*

To believe therefore as the word stands in the Front of the *CREED*, and not onely so, but is diffused through every Article and proposition of it, is to assent to the whole and every part of it, as to a certain and infallible truth revealed by God, (who by reason of his infinite knowledge cannot be deceived, and by reason of his transcendent holiness cannot deceive) and delivered unto us in the writings of the blessed Apostles and Prophets immediately inspired, moved and acted by God, out of whose writings this brief summe of necessary points of Faith was first * collected. And as this is properly to believe, which was our first consideration; so to say *I believe*, is to make a Confession or externall expression of the Faith, which is the second Consideration propounded.

Faith is an habit of the intellectual part of man, and therefore of it self invisible; and to believe is a spiritual act, and consequently immanent and internal, and known to no man but him who believeth: ^a For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of a man which is in him? Wherefore *Christ* being not onely the great Apostle sent to deliver these revealed truths, and so the authour of our Faith, but also the head of the Church, whose body consisteth of faithfull members, and so the authour of union and communion, which principally hath relation to the unity of Faith, he must needs be imagin'd to have appointed some externall expression and communication of it: especially considering that the sould of the Apostles was to go forth unto the ends of the world, and all nations to be called to the profession of the Gospel, and gathered into the Church of *Christ*; which cannot be performed without an acknowledgement of the truth, and a profession of Faith, without which no entrance into the Church, no admittance to Baptism. ^b What doth hinder me to be baptized? saith the Eunuch. And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that *Jesus Christ is the Son of God*. So believing with all his heart, as Philip required, and making profession of that Faith, he was admitted. ^c For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation. The belief of the heart is the internal habit residing in the Soul, and act of Faith proceeding from it, but terminated in the same; the confession of the mouth is an externall signification of the inward habit or act of Faith, by words expressing an acknowledgement of those truths which we believe or assent to in our Souls. [†] The ear receiveth the word, faith cometh by hearing; the ear conveyeth it to the heart, which being opened receiveth it, receiving believeth it; and then ^d out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh. In the heart Faith is seated; with the tongue confession is made; between these two Salvation is * completed. ^e If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord *Jesus*, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. This faith of the heart every one ought, and is presum'd to have; this confession of the mouth every one is known to make, when he pronounceth these words of the *CREED*, *I believe*; and if true, he may with comfort say, ^f the word of faith is nigh me, even in my mouth and in my heart: first in my heart really assenting, then in my mouth clearly and sincerely professing with the Prophet *David*, ^g I have believed, therefore have I spoken. Thus briefly from the second

* Οὐχ ὡς ἔδοξεν ἀνθρώποις συλλεγέσθαι τὰ τῆς πίστεως, ἀλλ' ἐκ πᾶσι καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἁγίων τοῦ πνεύματος συλλεγέσθαι τὰς ἀναγκαῖας τῆς πίστεως διδασκαλίας.

Cyrl. Catech. Ecclesiarum Patres de populorum salute solliciti ex diversis voluminibus Scripturarum collegerunt testimonia divinis graviora Sacramentis. Eusib. Gall. in Sym.

^a 1 Cor. 2. 11. ^b Act. 8. 36, 37.

^c Rom. 10. 10. Habes, homo, unde credere debes, corde fit confessio ad justitiam; habes unde debes confiteri, ore confessio fit ad salutem. Chrysost. Serm. 56.

[†] Sermo creat auditum, auditus concipit fidem, credulitatem parit, ore confessionem creditas nutrit, confessio perpetuam dat salutem. Chrysost. Serm. 60.

^d Mat. 12. 34. ^e Magnum,

filioli, per

hoc fidei nostrae videmus esse compendium, quando inter cor & linguam totum salutis humanae versatur & geritur Sacramentum.

Chrysost. Serm. 56. Quod a te & pro te reposcitur, intra te est, i. e. oris famulatus & cordis affectus. Eusib. Gall. ^f Rom. 10. 9.

^g Rom. 10. 8. De hoc sine dubio legimus per prophetam, Propet est, inquit, in ore tuo, & in corde tuo. Eusib. Gall. ^h Psal. 116. 10.

Confide-

Consideration concerning Confession implied in the first words *I believe*, we shall pass unto the third Consideration, of the necessity and particular obligation to such a Confession.

If there were no other argument, yet being the Object of Faith is supposed infallibly true, and acknowledged to be so by every one that believeth, being it is the nature of Truth not to hide it self, but rather to desire the light that it might appear; this were sufficient to move us to a *Confession* of our Faith. But beside the nature of the thing, we shall find many arguments obliging, pressing, urging us to such a profession. For first, from the same God, and by the same means by which we have received the Object of our Faith, by which we came under a possibility of Faith, we have also received an express command to make a *Confession* of the same: ^a *Be ready*, saith S. Peter, *always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you*; and there can be no reason of hope but what is grounded on Faith, nor can there be answer given unto that without an acknowledgement of this. Secondly, 'tis true indeed that the great promises of the Gospel are made unto Faith, and glorious things are spoken of it; but the same promises are made to the *Confession of faith* ^b together with it; and we know who it is hath said, ^c *Who-so-
ever shall confess me before men, him will I confess also before my Father which is
in heaven*. Besides, the profession of the faith of one Christian confirmeth and edifieth another in his, and the mutual benefit of all layeth an obligation upon every particular. Again, the matters of faith contain so much purity of doctrine, persuade such holiness of life, describe God so infinitely glorious, so transcendently gracious, so loving in himself, so mercifull in his Son, so wonderful in all his works, that the sole confession of it glorifieth God; and how can we expect to enter into that glory which is none of ours, if we deny God that glory which is his? Lastly, the concealing those truths which he hath revealed, the not acknowledging that faith which we are thought to believe, is so far from giving God that glory which is due unto him, that it dishonour-
eth the faith which it refuseth or neglecteth to profess, and casteth a kind of contumely upon the authour of it, as if God had revealed that which man should be ashamed to acknowledge. Wherefore he that came to save us hath also said unto us, ^d *Who-soever shall be ashamed of me and of my words, of him shall
the Son of man be ashamed, when he shall come in his own glory, and in his Fa-
ther's, and of the holy Angels*. Such a necessity there is of Confession of Faith, in respect of God, who commanded it, and is glorified in it; in respect of our selves, who shall be rewarded for it; and in respect of our brethren, who are edified and confirmed by it. Which necessity the wisdom of the Church in former Ages hath thought a sufficient ground to command the recitation of the *CREED* at the ^e first initiation into the Church by Baptism, (for which purpose it was taught and expounded to those which were to be baptized imme-

^a 1 Pet. 3. 15.

^b Rom. 10.

^c Mat. 10. 32.

^d Luke 9. 26.
* Ο τὸν κα-
νὼν τῆς ἀ-
ληθείας ἀλλ'-
οὐ ἐξ αὐτοῦ
κατάρχων ὁ
δὲ τὸ βα-
πτισμῶν
ἐλάττω. Iren.
l. 1. c. 1.
Cum sub cri-
bus & testa-
tio fidei &
sponsio salu-

tis pignorentur, necessarii adjicitur Ecclesiae mentio, quoniam ubi tres, id est, Pater, Filius, & Spiritus Sanctus, ibi Ecclesia, quæ trium corpus est. *Tertull. de Baptis.* In quem tingere? in poenitentiam? quo ergo illi præcursores? in peccatorum remissionem, quam verbo dabat? in semetipsum, quem humilitate celabat? in Spiritum Sanctum, qui nondum à Patre descenderat? in Ecclesiam, quam nondum Apostoli struxerant? *Id.* Dehinc ter mergimur, amplius aliquid respondentes quam Dominus in Evangelio determinavit. *Id. de Cor. Militis.* Sed & ipsa interrogatio quæ fit in Baptismo testis est veritatis. nam cum dicimus, *Credis in vitam æternam, & remissionem peccatorum per sanctam Ecclesiam?* intelligimus remissionem peccatorum non nisi in Ecclesia dari. *S. Cyprianus, Ep. ad Januarius, &c.* Quod si aliquis illud opponit, ut dicat eandem Novatianum legem tenere quam Catholica Ecclesia tenear, eodem Symbolo quo & nos baptizare, eundem nosse Deum Patrem, eundem filium Christum, eundem Spiritum Sanctum, ac propterea usurpare eum potestatem baptizandi posse, quod videatur in interrogatione baptismi à nobis non discrepare: sciat quisquis hoc opponendum putat, non esse unam nobis & Schismaticis Symboli legem, neque eandem interrogationem. Nam cum dicunt, *Credis remissionem peccatorum, & vitam æternam per sanctam Ecclesiam?* mentiuntur in interrogatione, quando non habeant Ecclesiam. *Idem, Epist. ad Magnum.* Mos ibi (id est, Romæ) servatur antiquus, eos qui gratiam Baptismi suscepturi sunt, publice, id est, fidelium populo audiente, Symbolum reddere. *Ruffin. in Symb.* Solenne est in lavacro, post Trinitatis confessionem interrogare, *Credis in sanctam Ecclesiam?* credis remissionem peccatorum? *S. Hieron. contra Lucifer.* Mens hæretica reliquit Doctorem à quo fidem Ecclesie didicerat, oblita est pacti Dei sui, hoc est, fidei ipsius Dominicæ quæ in Symbolo continetur, quam se die baptismatis servaturum esse promiserat. *Id. Comm. in Prov.* Interrogatus es, *Credis in Deum*

Patrem omnipotentem ? dixisti, Credo, & misisti, hoc est, sepultus es. Iterum interrogatus es, Credis in Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum, & in crucem ejus ? dixisti, Credo, & misisti, ideo & Christo es confepultus. Tertiò interrogatus, Credis in Spiritum Sanctum ? dixisti, Credo ; tertiò misisti : ut multiplicem lapsum superioris ætatis abolveret trina confessio. Ambros. de Sacram. l. 2. c. 7. Leo speaks thus of Eutyches in his Epistle to Flavians, Quam enim eruditionem de sacris Novi & Veteris Testamenti paginis acquisivit, qui nè ipsius quidem Symboli initia comprehendit ? & quod per totum mundum omnium regeneratorum voce depromitur, istius adhuc fenis corde non capitur. And in the 12. Book of Trinitate (formerly attributed to Athanasius, but more probably now thought to belong to Vigilius Tapsciss), Nec non & illa magna & beata Confessio Fidei, imò ipsa Fides Sanctorum, & Testamentum quod disposuimus ad Patrem, Filium & Spiritum Sanctum, ad sacrum lavacrum regenerationis venientes, Credo in Deum Patrem omnipotentem, & in Jesum Christum Filium ejus unigenitum, & in Spiritum Sanctum. Καθὰς παραδεδομένον παρὰ τοῦ σοφὸς ἡμῶν ἐπισκόπου ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ κατηγορίᾳ, καὶ ὅτε τοὺς λατοὺν ἐλαμβάνομεν. Ensh. of the Confession of Faith which he exhibited to the Council of Nice. Socr. l. 1. c. 8. Theodor. l. 1. c. 13. Abrenunciò, inquis, Diabolo, pompis, spectaculis, & operibus ejus ; & quid postea ? Credo, inquis, in Deum Patrem omnipotentem. Salvianus de Gubern. Dei lib. 6. And when this Creed was enlarged by the Council of Nice, and after that by others, Epiphanius commends it to the Catechumeni, to be repeated at their Baptism ; ὅπως ἐκαστος τοῦ καταρχαίου τοῦ μαλόντων πρὸς αὐτοὺς λατοῦν προσέτινα, οὕτως ἐπαυξήσαντες ὁράετε τοὺς πεποιμένους τοῖς εὐαγγέλιον τοῖς κειμένοι ἀλλὰ καὶ διδάσκοντες ἄλληλους, ὥς πάντων ἢ αὐτῷ μίσηται ἢ αὐτῷ γινώσκονται καὶ ἡμῶν, τοὺς λέγοντας, Πιστεύωμι εἰς θεὸν Θεόν, &c. Epiph. in Ancorato. And when he had yet farther enlarged it by reason of some new emergent Heresies, he commands it, μάστιγι τοῖς πρὸς αὐτοὺς λατοῦν προσεσθῆναι, ἵνα ἀπὸ τῆς λέξεως αὐτῆς. Ib. The first Council of Constantinople confirms the Nicene Confession as προσκοινηθέντα τῷ ὄνομα τῷ ἀνάγκη πρὸς βασιλείαν. Theodor. lib. 5. cap. 9. And the Council of Chalcedon of the same, ὡς κοινὴν ἐξ ἁγίων συνάγωγα, τοῖς μυμήτοις τοῖς πρὸς τῆς ὑποστάσεως παρεχόμενον ἀσφάλεια. Parte tertiâ. The Synod at Jerusalem, τὸ ἅγιον συνέβουλον εἰς ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ βασιλέως. The Synod at Tyre, ἐν αὐτῇ βασιλεύοντες καὶ βαπτίζοντες. And the Council of Constantinople under Menna, to which the former sent their Synodical Letters, τὸ ἅγιον συνέβουλον ἐκ πάντων ἐκκλησιῶν. Concil. Constantinop. sub Agap. & Menna, Act. 5. Basiliscus and Marcus, in two several Edicts, confirmed the same Nicene Creed with these words, οἱς ὁ ἡμεῖς καὶ πάντες οἱ σοφὸς ἡμῶν πιστεύουσιν ἐκκλησίαν. Enshr. lib. 3. cap. 4. and 7. and the Edict of the Emperor Justinian, Anathematizaverunt eos qui aliam definitionem fidei, five Symbolum, five Mathema, tradunt accedentibus ad sanctum baptismum.

* Ὁν δὲ
τοῦ ποτηρίου
τοῦ πνεύματος
καὶ τῆς
ἀγάπης τῆς
ἐκδοκούσης
ἐκ παλαιάν
τῆς ἐκδοκούσης
ἐν τοῖς ᾠ-
κουμένοις.
Concil. Lae-
dic. Can. 46.
Where it is to
be observed
that ~~the~~ is
taken for the
Credo, or
Symbolum
fidei, and was
so translated
anciently, as
appeareth by
the Canon pre-
served in the
Canon-law, and
rendered
thus, Bapti-
zandos oportet
Symbolum
dicere, et
quinta feria
ultima septima-
nae vel
Episcopo vel

diately * before the great Solemnity of *Easter*) and to require a particular † repetition of it publicly as often as the Sacrament of the Eucharist was administered, and a constant and perpetual inculcation of the same by the * Clergy to the people.

And as this necessity is great, as the practice usefull and advantageous; so is the obligation of believing and confessing particular, binding every single Christian, observable in the number and person expressed, *I believe*. As if *Christ* did question every one in particular, as he did him who was born blind after he had restored him his sight, (and we are all in his condition) *a Dost thou believe on the Son of God?* every single Christian is taught to make the same Answer which he made, *Lord, I believe*. As if the Son of God did promise to every one of them which are gathered together in his name, what he promised to *b one of the multitude whose son had a dumb spirit, If thou canst believe, all things are possible to him that believeth*; each one for himself returneth his answer, *Lord, I believe; Lord, help my unbelief*. Not that it is unlawfull or unfit to use another number, and in stead of *I*, to say, *We believe*: for taking in of others, we exclude not our selves; and addition of charity can be no disparagement to confession of faith. *S. Peter* answered for the twelve, *c We believe, and are sure that thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God*. For though *Christ* immediately replied that *one of them had a devil*, yet is not *S. Peter* blam'd, who knew it not. But every one is taught to expresse his own faith, because by that he is to stand or fall. *d The effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much* for the benefit of his brother, but his faith availeth nothing for the justification of another. And it is otherwise very fit that our faith should be manifested by a particular confession, because it is effectual by par-

Presbyteris reddere. *De Consec. dist. 4. cap. 58.* Symbolum etiam placuit ab omnibus Ecclesiis unâ die, i. e. ante octo dies Dominicæ resurrectionis, publicè in Ecclesia competentibus prædicari. *Concil. Agath. capit. 13.* Sicut antiqui Canones jubent, ante viginti dies Baptismi ad purgationem exorcismi Catechumeni currant, in quibus viginti diebus omnino Catechumeni Symbolum, quod est, *Credo in Deum Patrem omnipotentem*, specialiter doceantur. *Concil. Bracar. 2. cap. 1. The Canon of the Laodicean Council, already mentioned, is verbatim rehearsed in the sixth Council in Trulla, Can. 78. It appears therefore a general command of the Church, that those who were to be baptized, should have a certain time allotted for the learning and rehearsing of the Creed. And in case of Necessity if any were baptized, they were to learn the Creed immediately after their Baptism, ὅτι δεῖ (not, as it is in the Edition of Binius, both in this Canon and the former, most absurdly, ὅτι εἰς δεῖ) καὶ ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ παραλαβέντας τὸ ῥησμός, καὶ ἅτα ἀναγνόντας, ἐκμαθάνειν τὸν λόγον, καὶ ἠνέσκειν ὅτι δεῖας διωρεῖς κατηχούμενων. Concil. Laodic. Can. 47. † As appears in the ancient Greek Liturgies, and the Decree of the third Council of Toledo, ut omni sacrificiū tempore ante communionem corporis Christi & sanguinis, juxta Orientalium primum morem, unanimiter clarâ voce sacratissimum fidei recenseant Symbolum. * Concil. Mogunt. cap. 45. Symbolum, quod est signaculum fidei, & Orationem Dominicam discere semper admovent sacerdotes populum Christianum. ^a John 9. 35, 38. ^b Mar. 9. 17, 23, 24. ^c John 6. 69. ^d Jam. 5. 16.*

ticular

tical application ; therefore must it needs be proper for me to say, *I believe*, and to make profession of my *faith in the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me.* Gal. 2. 20.

Having then described the true nature and notion of *Belief*, the duty of *confessing* our Faith, and the obligation of every particular Christian to *believe* and to *confess* ; being in these three explications all which can be imaginably contained in the first word of the *CREED* must necessarily be included ; it will now be easie for me to deliver, and for every particular person to understand what it is he says, and upon what ground he proceeds, when he begins his *Confession* with these words, *I believe*, which I conceive may in this manner be fitly expressed.

Although those things which I am ready to affirm be not apparent to my sense, so that I cannot say I see them ; although they be not evident to my understanding of themselves, nor appear unto me true by the virtue of any natural and necessary cause, so that I cannot say I have any proper knowledge or science of them : yet being they are certainly contained in the Scriptures, the writings of the blessed Apostles and Prophets ; being those Apostles and Prophets were endued with miraculous power from above, and immediately inspired with the Holy Ghost, and consequently what they delivered was not the word of man, but of God himself ; being God is of that universal knowledge and infinite wisdom, that it is impossible he should be deceived, of that indefectible holiness and transcendent rectitude, that it is not imaginable he should intend to deceive any man, and consequently whatsoever he hath delivered for a truth must be necessarily and infallibly true ; I readily and stedfastly assent unto them as most certain truths, and am as fully and absolutely, and more concerningly persuaded of them, then of any thing I see or know. And because that God who hath revealed them hath done it not for my benefit onely, but for the advantage of others, nor for that alone, but also for the manifestation of his own glory ; being for those ends he hath commanded me to profess them, and hath promised an eternall reward upon my profession of them ; being every particular person is to expect the justification of himself, and the Salvation of his Soul, upon the condition of his own Faith : as with a certain and full persuasion I assent unto them, so with a fixed and undaunted resolution I will profess them ; and with this faith in my heart, and confession in my mouth, in respect of the whole body of the *CREED*, and every Article and particle in it, I sincerely, readily, resolvedly say, *I believe*.

I Believe in God.

HAVING delivered the Nature of *Faith*, and the act of *Belief* common to all the Articles of the *Creed*, that we may understand what it is to *believe* ; we shall proceed to the explication of the Articles themselves, as the most necessary objects of our *Faith*, that we may know what is chiefly to be believed. Where immediately we meet with another word as general as the former, and as universally concern'd in every Article, which is *GOD* : for if to *believe* be to assent upon the testimony of God, as we have before declared, then wheresoever belief is expressed or implied, there is also the name of *God* understood, upon whose testimony we *believe*. He therefore whose authority is the ground and foundation of the whole, his existence begins the *Creed*, as the foundation of that authority. For if there can be no divine Faith without the attestation of *God*, by which alone it becomes divine, and there can be no such attestation, except there were an existence of the testifier,

* Θεός, Θεός
* Θεός ἢ ὁ τῶν
ἡμετέρων
τῶν Θεός, Θεός
ἀόριστος, ἐπεὶ
ὁμοῦ καὶ ὁμοῦ.
Hefych. Lex.

fier, then must it needs be proper to begin the *Confession* of our Faith with the agnition of our God. If his * name were thought fit to be express'd in the front of every action even by the heathen, because they thought no action prospered but by his approbation; much more ought we to fix it before our *Confession*, because without him to believe as we profess, is no less then a contradiction.

Now these words, *I believe in God*, will require a double consideration; one, of the phrase or manner of speech; another, of the thing or nature of the truth in that manner expressed. For to believe with an addition of the preposition *in*, is a phrase or expression ordinarily conceived fit to be given to none but to God himself, as always implying, beside a bare act of Faith, an addition of hope, love, and affiance. An observation, as I conceive, prevailing especially in the *Latine Church*, grounded principally upon the authority of † *S. Augustine*. Whereas among the *Greeks*, in whose Language the New Testament was penn'd, I perceive no such constant distinction in their deliveries of the *Creed*; and in the * *Hebrew Language* of the Old, from which the *Jewish* and *Christian Greeks* received that phrase of *believing in*, it hath no such peculiar and accumulative signification. For it is sometimes attributed to God, the authour and original cause, sometimes to the Prophets, the immediate revealers, of the Faith; sometimes it is spoken of Miracles, the motives to believe; sometimes of the Law of God, the material Object of our Faith. Among all which varieties of that phrase of speech, it is sufficiently apparent, that in this *Confession* of Faith it is most proper to admit it in the last accepti-

† For Ser.
181. which
is upon the
Credo, we find
these words:
Non dicit,
Credo Deum,
vel Credo
Deo, quam-
vis & hæc se-
luti necessa-
ria sint. Ali-
ud enim est
credere illi,

aliud credere illum, aliud credere in illum. Credere illi, est credere vera esse quæ loquitur; Credere illum, credere quia ipse est Deus; Credere in illum, diligere illum. And though that collection of Sermons de Tempore under the name of *S. Augustine* be not all his, (directors of them being Translations of the Greek Homilies,) yet this distinction may be collected out of other parts of his works. For first, he distinguisheth very clearly and seriously between credere Deo, and credere in Deum. Nunquam aliquis Apostolorum dicere aunder, Qui credit in me. Credimus Apostolo, sed non credimus in Apostolum. Tract. 54. in Psalm. And again, Credimus Paulo, sed non credimus in Paulum; credimus Petro, sed non credimus in Petrum. Secondly, he distinguisheth between credere Deum, and credere in Deum. Multum interest utrum quis credat ipsum esse Christum, & utrum credat in Christum. Ille credit in Christum qui & sperat in Christum, & diligit Christum. De verbis Dom. Sermon. 61. And, which is the summe of all, he puts a high value upon the preposition, as if by virtue of the addition of in the phrase did properly signifie so great an accessio nato fidei. Quid est credere in Deum? credendo amare, credendo diligere, credendo in eum ire, & ejus membris incorporari. Tract. 29. in Job. which doctrine of *S. Augustine's*, being taken notice of by Peter Lombard, hath since been continued by the Schoolmen; and Aquinas, Sum. 2. 22. q. 2. §. 2. ad primum, bringing all three under one act of Faith, hath been contradicted by Durand. in 3. Sent. dist. 23. q. 7. §. 6. Credere in Deum non est præcise actus fidei, sed fidei & charitatis simul; & sunt etiam plures, & non unus actus tantum: by whose subtle, but yet clear, determination (as many of his are beyond the rest of the Schools) whatsoever is added by the preposition to believe, appears not to be a part of Belief, but an act superadded to the act of Faith. * For אֱמוּנָה is sometimes joyned with ה', sometimes with ב': when with ה', it answers properly to אֱמוּנָהּ בְּיָדֶיךָ אֱלֹהִים, credere Deo, (ה' being nothing else but a significator of the case;) when with ב', it corresponds to אֱמוּנָהּ בְּיָדֶיךָ אֱלֹהִים, credere in Deum, (ב' being a preposition of the same nature with eis or in.) But yet there is so little, or rather no difference in the Hebrew, that in the first place where it is used, and that of the Father of the faithful, even for the act of justifying faith, בְּיָדֶיךָ אֱלֹהִים Gen. 15. 6. it is translated by the LXX. ἡ ἐμπιστευσις Ἀβραμῆ τῷ Θεῷ, not eis Θεῷ, and that translation warranted by *S. Paul*, Rom. 4. 3. Gal. 3. 6. and *S. James* 2. 23. In the same manner 2 Kings 17. 14. אֱמוּנָהּ בְּיָדֶיךָ אֱלֹהִים is translated by the LXX. (as that Translation is preserved in the Alexandrian and Complutensian Copies) οἱ ἐκ ἐμπιστεύοντες καὶ τῷ Θεῷ αὐτῶν. Beside the same phrase is used in the same place both to God and to man, as Exod. 14. 31. וַיֵּאֱמְנוּ בַיהוָה וּבַנְבִּיאָת מֹשֶׁה, and they believed in God and in his servant Moses, which the Chaldee Paraphrase explaineth thus, וַיֵּאֱמְנוּ בַיהוָה וּבַנְבִּיאָת מֹשֶׁה, and they believed in the word of God, and in the prophecy of Moses his servant. And 2 Chron. 20. 20. וַיֵּאֱמְנוּ אֲלֵהֶיכֶם וְהָאֱמִינוּ, Believe in the Lord your God, so shall ye be established; believe in his prophets, so shall ye prosper. For although the Vulgar Latine, which our Translation followeth, hath made that distinction which the Hebrew maketh not, Credite in Domino Deo vestro, & securi eritis; credite prophetis ejus, & cuncta evenient prospera: yet the Septuagint acknowledges no necessity of receding from the original phrase, ἐμπιστεύοντες ἐν κυρίῳ καὶ τῷ Θεῷ ὑμῶν, καὶ ἐμπιστεύοντες ἐν τοῖς προφήταις αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐκαστὸν ἐκαστῶν. Nor is it only attributed to Moses as joyned with God, and so taken as it were into the same phrase, but separately by himself, as Exod. 19. 9. The Lord said unto Moses, Lo, I come unto thee in a thick cloud, that the people may hear when I speak with thee, וְאָמַן בְּיָדֶיךָ אֱלֹהִים, and believe in thee for ever. And therefore when it was objected to *S. Basil*, that they did believe in Moses, as well as that they were baptized into Moses, and generally, ἡ πίστις ἀπελάττειται ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ ἐκαστῶν τῶν προφητῶν, the Father doth not deny the language, but interpret it, ἡ ἐκαστὴν τῶν πιστῶν ἐστὶ τὸν κύριον ἀναστρέφει. De Sp. S. c. 14. Neither is this only spoken of Moses and the Prophets, that the Israelites believed in them, but of David, not as a Prophet, but as a have relator of his own actions, 1 Sam. 27. 12. וַיֵּאֱמְנוּ אֲנִי בַדָּוִד, καὶ ἐμπιστεύοντες Ἀχίς ἐν Δαυὶδ, Vulg. Et credidit Achis in David. Est ergo fides nostra primò quidem omnium in Dominum Jesum Christum, consequenter verò etiam in omnes sanctos Patriarchas, vel Prophetas, vel Apostolos Christi. Origenes in Apologia Pamphili. To conclude, this general phrase of believing in, is originally attributed sometimes to the supreme authour of our Faith, as to God; sometimes to the intervenient messengers, as the Prophets; sometimes to the motives of our Faith, Psalm. 78. 32. וְלֹא הָאֱמִינוּ בַנְּפִלְאוֹתָיו, LXX. καὶ ἐκ ἐμπιστεύοντες ἐν τοῖς θαυμαστοῖς αὐτοῦ, and they believed not for his wondrous works; sometimes to the object of it, or that which is believed, as Psalm. 119. 66. בַּמִּצְוֹת הָאֱמִנְתִּי I have believed in thy Commandments, as Mar. 1. 15. πιστεύει ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ.

on,

on, by which it is attributed to the material object of belief. For the *Creed* being nothing else but a brief comprehension of the most necessary matters of Faith, whatsoever is contained in it beside the first word *I believe*, by which we make confession of our Faith, can be nothing else but part of those verities to be believed, and the act of belief in respect of them nothing but an assent unto them as divinely credible and infallible truths. Neither can we conceive that the ancient *Greek* Fathers of the Church could have any farther meaning in it, who make the whole body of the *Creed* to be of the same nature, as so many truths to be believed, acknowledged and confessed; inso-much as sometimes they use not * *believing in*, neither for the Father, Son, nor Holy Ghost; sometimes using it as to them, they † continue the same to the following Articles of, *the Catholick Church, the Communion of Saints, &c.* and * generally speak of the *Creed* as of nothing but mere matter of Faith, without any intimation of Hope, † Love, or any such notion included in it. So that *believing in*, by virtue of the phrase or manner of speech, whether we look upon the original use of it in the *Hebrew*, or the derivative in the *Greek*, or the sense of it in the first Christians in the *Latine* Church, can be of no farther real importance in the *Creed* in respect of God, who immediately follows, then to acknowledge and assert his being or existence. Nor ought this to be imagin'd a slender notion or small part of the first Article of our Faith, — when it really is the foundation of this and all the rest; that as the *Creed* is fundamental in respect of other truths, this is the * foundation even of the Fundamentals. † For he that cometh to God must believe that he is. And this I take for a sufficient explication of the phrase, *I believe in God*, that is, *I believe that God is*.

* S. Basil. *περὶ τοῦ εἶναι καὶ ὁμολογεῖν* ὅτι ἓνα μόνον ἀληθινὸν καὶ ἀγαθὸν θεόν, καὶ ἓνα καὶ μόνον πνεῦμα ἄγιον.
† Arius and Euzoius in their Confession delivered to Constantine, Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἓνα θεὸν πατέρα, καὶ εἰς ἓνα υἱόν, καὶ εἰς τὸ ἄγιον πνεῦμα, καὶ εἰς ἓν ἑαυτοῦ.

ἀνάστασιν, καὶ εἰς ζωὴν τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος, καὶ εἰς βασιλείαν ἑσπερίαν, καὶ εἰς μίαν καθολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ θεοῦ. Socrat. Hist. Eccl. l. 1. c. 26. Sozom. l. 2. c. 27. S. Cyril. Hierosol. Κατήχησις in φησὶ οὐδὲν ἡθελοῦς εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα ἄγιον, καὶ εἰς μίαν ἁγίαν καθολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ εἰς σαρκεῖς ἀνάστασιν, καὶ εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον. Epiph. in Anc. εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἄγιον, εἰς μίαν ἁγίαν καθολικὴν καὶ Ἀποστολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν and in a larger Confession, πνεύματι εἰς μίαν καθολικὴν καὶ Ἀποστολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ εἰς ἐν βάπτισμα μετανοίας, καὶ εἰς ἀνάστασιν νεκρῶν, καὶ εἰς βασιλείαν ἑσπερίαν, καὶ εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον. * Greg. Nyssen calls them εὐσεβεῖς καὶ θεοῦ ὁμολογῆσαι and Eusebius, in his Confession exhibited to the Council of Nice, concludes, Πιστεύομεν καὶ εἰς ἓν πνεῦμα ἄγιον, τῶντων ἑσπερίαν καὶ ὁμολογεῖν πνεύματι, signifying that every particular which he had rehearsed he believed to be, and that was all in the Confession intended. Alexander Bishop of Alexandria, after a long declaration of the former Articles concerning the Father and the Son, draws to a conclusion on the latter Articles, thus; Περὶ τῆς εὐσεβείας (i. εὐσεβείας) ταύτης καὶ πατρὸς καὶ υἱὸς καὶ πνεῦμα ἄγιον ὁμολογεῖν μίαν καὶ μόνην καθολικὴν καὶ Ἀποστολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν — καὶ τῶντων (vel τῶντων) ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνάστασιν οἰδεύμεν. Theodoret. Hist. Eccl. l. 1. c. 4. So Tertul. de Praescript. adv. Haeret. Regula est fidei illa quæ creditur Unum omnino Deum esse; et adv. Praxeam, cap. 2. where he makes another rehearsal of his Creed, he begins with Unicum quidem Deum credimus. † Non est amor Dei Articulus, neque etiam amor proximi; quia etiam sint praecepta generalia activa, tamen cum actio contineatur, non oportet eum constituere articulum: sed ista sunt fidei dogmata quæ sunt columnæ & fundamenta legis divinæ. If. Abnavanel de Cap. Fidei, c. 11. Primus est Deorum cultus, Deos credere. Sen. † Maimonides de Fundam. Legis, *הפסוק הראשון במצותנו הוא מציא בל יסודותיהם* the foundation of foundations and pillar of wisdoms is to know that the first Being is, and that it giveth existence to every thing which is. * Heb. 11. 6.

As for the matter or truth contained in these words so explained, it admits a threefold consideration, first, of the Notion of *God*, what is here understood by that name; secondly, of the Existence of *God*, how we know or believe that he is; thirdly, the Unity of *God*, in that, though *there be Gods many, and Lords many*, yet in our *Creed* we mention him as but one. When therefore we shall have clearly delivered what is the true notion of *God* in whom we believe, how and by what means we come to assure our selves of the existence of such a Deity, and upon what grounds we apprehend him of such a transcendent nature that he can admit no competitor; then may we be conceived to have sufficiently explicated the former part of the first Article; then may every one understand what he says, and upon what ground he proceeds, when he professeth, *I believe in God*.

The name of *God* is attributed unto many, but here is to be understood of him who by way of eminency and excellency bears that name, and therefore

Deut. 10. 17.
Psal. 136. 2.
Dan. 2. 47.
and 11. 36.
Gen. 14. 18.
69. 20, 22.
Rom. 9. 5.
Ephes. 4. 6.
Imprimis ne-
cesse est con-
cedatis esse
aliquem
sublimiorem
Deum &
manipem
quendam di-
vinitatis, qui
ex hominibus
Deos fecerit.
Tertul. adv.
Gent.
Gal. 4. 8.
* Ego dixi,
Dii estis; sed
in eo indulti
nominis si-
gnificatio est:
& ubi refer-
tur, ego dixi,
loquentis est
potius sermo
quam rei no-
men. S. Hilari-
us de Trin. l. 7.
† Deus plenæ
ac perfectæ
divinitatis
est nomen.
Hilari. de Trin.
l. 11.
Deus sub-
stantiæ ipsius
nomen, id
est, Divini-
tatis. Tertul.
adv. Herm.

is styled ^a *God of gods*; *The Lord our God is God of gods, and Lord of lords*: and in the same respect is called ^b *the most high God*, (others being but inferiour, or under him,) and *God* ^c *over or above all*. This eminency and excellency, by which these titles become proper unto him and incommunicable to any other, is grounded upon the divine nature or essence, which all other who are called gods have not, and therefore are not by nature gods. ^d *Then when ye knew not God*, saith S. Paul, *ye did service to them which by nature are not gods*. There is then a God by nature, and others which are called gods, but by nature are not so: for either they have no power at all, because no being, but onely in the false opinions of deceived men, as the gods of the Heathen; or if they have any real power or authority, from whence some are * called *gods* in the Scripture, yet have they it not from themselves or of their own nature, but from him who *onely hath immortality*, and consequently onely Divinity, and therefore is the *onely true God*. So that the Notion of a Deity doth at last expressly signifie a Being or nature of † infinite perfection; and the infinite perfection of a Nature or Being consisteth in this, that it be absolutely and essentially necessary, an actual being of it self; and potential or causative of all Beings beside it self, independent from any other, upon which all things else depend, and by which all things else are governed. 'Tis true indeed, that to give a perfect definition of *God* is impossible, neither can our finite reason hold any proportion with infinity: but yet a sense of this Divinity we have, and the first and common Notion of it consists in these three particulars, that it is a Being of it self, and independent from any other; that it is that upon which all things which are made depend; that it governs all things. And this I conceive sufficient as to the first consideration, in reference to the Notion of a *God*.

As for the existence of such a Being, how it comes to be known unto us, or by what means we are assured of it, is not so unanimously agreed upon, as that it is. For although some have imagined that the knowledge of a Deity is connatural to the Soul of man, so that every man hath a connate inbred notion of a *God*; yet I rather conceive the Soul of man to have no connatural knowledge at all, no particular notion of any thing, ~~it from the begin-~~ning; but being we can have no assurance of its preexistence, we may more rationally judge it to receive the first apprehensions of things by sense, and by them to make all rational collections. If then the Soul of man be at the first like a fair smooth Table without any actual characters of knowledge imprinted in it; if all the knowledge which we have comes successively by sensation, instruction, and rational collection; then must we not refer the apprehension of a Deity to any connate notion or inbred opinion; at least we are assured God never chargeth us with the knowledge of him upon that account.

Again, although others do affirm, that the existence of God is a truth evident of it self, so as whosoever hears but these terms once named, that *God is*, cannot chuse but acknowledge it for a certain and infallible truth upon the first apprehension; that as no man can deny that the whole is greater then any part, who knoweth onely what is meant by *whole*, and what by *part*; so no man can possibly deny or doubt of the existence of *God*, who knows but what is meant by *God*, and what it is to be: Yet can we not ground our knowledge of *God's* existence upon any such clear and immediate evidence: nor were it safe to lay it upon such a ground, because whosoever should deny it, could not by this means be convinced; it being a very irrational way of instruction to tell a man that doubts of this truth, that he must believe it because 'tis evident unto him, when he knows that he therefore onely doubts of it because it is not evident unto him.

Although

Although therefore that, *God is*, be of it self an immediate, certain, necessary truth, yet must it be * evidenced and made apparent unto us by its connexion unto other truths; so that the Being of the Creatour may appear unto us by his Creature, and the dependency of inferiour entities lead us to a clear acknowledgement of the supreme and independent Being. The wisdom of the Jews thought this method proper; * *for by the greatness and beauty of the creatures, proportionably the maker of them is seen*: and not onely they, but S. Paul hath taught us, that *the invisible things of God from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead*. For if † *Phidias* could so contrive a piece of his own work, as in it to preserve the memory of himself, never to be obliterated without the destruction of the work; well may we reade the great Artificer of the world in the works of his own hands, and by the existence of any thing demonstrate the first Cause of all things.

* Hæc propositio, Deus est, quantum in se est, per se nota est, quia prædicatum est idem cum subiecto, Deus enim est suum esse. Sed quia nos non sciimus de Deo quid est, non est nobis per se nota, sed indiget demonstrari per ea quæ sunt

magis nota quoad nos, & minus nota quoad naturam, scilicet per effectus. *Aquin.* 1. p. q. 2. art. 1. * *Wisd.* of Sol. 13. 5. *Rom.* 1. 20. This place must be vindicated from the false gloss of Socinus, who contends that it cannot be proved from the Creature that there is a God, and therefore to this place of S. Paul answers thus: Sciendum est verba à creatione mundi debere conjungi cum verbo *Invisibilia*—At igitur eo in loco Apostolus, *eternam divinitatem Dei*, i. id quod nos Deus perpetuo facere vult, (*Divinitas enim hoc sensu alibi quoque quod ipsum enuntiatur, ut Col. 2. 9.*) *eternamque potentiam*, i. promissiones quæ nunquam intercedunt, (quo sensu paulo superius dixerat *Evangelium esse potentiam Dei*) hæc, inquam, quæ nunquam postquam mundus creatus est ab hominibus visâ fuerant, i. non fuerant eis cognita, per opera, hoc est, per mirabiles ipsius Dei & divinorum hominum, præsertim v. Christi & Apostolorum ejus operationes, conspecta fuisse. In which explication there is nothing which is not forced and distorted: for though his first observation seem plausible, yet there is no validity in it. He bringeth only for proof *Matt.* 13. 35. *καρπυμωδία* *καὶ ἡγετοῦς κόσμος*, which proves not at all that *καὶ ἡγετοῦς* has the same sense: and it is more probable that it hath not, because that is usually expressed by *καὶ ἡγετοῦς* *καὶ ἡγετοῦς*, *Mar.* 10. 6. and 13. 19. 2 *Pet.* 3. 4. never by *καὶ ἡγετοῦς*. Besides, the *καρπυμωδία* in S. Matthew bears not that analogy with *ἀόρατα* which Socinus pretends, signifying not things unseen or unknown till then, but only obscure sayings, or parables; for which purpose these words were produced out of the Psalms by the Evangelist, to prove that the Messias was to speak in parables, in the Original *דְּבָרֵי חֵסֶד*, *LXX.* *καρπυμωδία καὶ ἡγετοῦς*, i. wise ancient sayings, which were not unseen and unknown, for it immediately followeth, which we have heard and known, and our fathers have told us, *Psal.* 78. 3. And though he would make out this interpretation, by accusing other Interpreters of unfaithfulness, Plerique interpretes ex præpositione *καὶ*, ex fecerunt, contra ipsorum Græcorum Codicum fidem, qui non *καὶ ἡγετοῦς*, sed *καὶ ἡγετοῦς*, habent: yet there is no ground for such a calumny, because *καὶ* may be, and is often, rendered *ex* or *ex* as well as *et*, as *Matt.* 3. 4. *καὶ τρυφῶν καμήλας*, *et pilis camelinis*, 7. 4. *καὶ τὸ ὄφθαλμὸς σου*, *ex oculo tuo*, 16. *καὶ ἀνασθῶν*, *ex spinis*; and even in the sense which Socinus contends for, *Matt.* 17. 18. *καὶ τῆς ὥρας ἐκείνης*, *V. T.* *ex illâ horâ*, as Tully, *ex eo die*, and Virgil, *Ex illo Corydon*, Corydon est tempore nobis, and, Tempore jam ex illo casus mihi cognitus urbis Trojanæ. So the Greek *καὶ μετὰ* the Latines render ex parte, *ἀπὸ τοῦ ἰσθμοῦ*, *ex æquo*: of which examples are innumerable. There is no unfaithfulness then imputable to the Interpreters: nor can such pitifull Criticisms give any advantage to the first part of Socinus's Exposition. Howsoever the Catholick interpretation depends not on those words *καὶ ἡγετοῦς*, but on the consideration of the persons, that is, the Gentiles, and the other words, *καὶ ἡγετοῦς* *καὶ ἡγετοῦς*, which he farther perverts, rendering them the miraculous operations of Christ and his Apostles, or, as one of our Learned men, their doings, mistaking *καὶ ἡγετοῦς*, which is from the passive *καὶ ἡγετοῦς*, for *καὶ ἡγετοῦς*, from the active *καὶ ἡγετοῦς*; for *καὶ ἡγετοῦς* is properly the thing made or created, not the operation or doing of it; as *καὶ ἡγετοῦς* is sometimes taken for the creature, sometimes for the creation, but *καὶ ἡγετοῦς* is the creature onely. As therefore we reade 1 *Tim.* 4. 4. *καὶ ἡγετοῦς* *καὶ ἡγετοῦς* *καὶ ἡγετοῦς* so *Eph.* 2. 10. *καὶ ἡγετοῦς* *καὶ ἡγετοῦς* *καὶ ἡγετοῦς*. In this sense spake Thales properly, *Προϋστάτωρ ὅς ὄντων* *θεός, ἀνέστην γὰρ. καλλίστην κόσμον, πίνυμα γὰρ θεῶ.* *Laert.* The other Interpretations, which he was forced to, are yet more extravagant: as when he renders the eternal Godhead, that which God would always have us doe, or, his everlasting will, and proves that rendition by another place of S. Paul, *Col.* 2. 9. For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily, that is, says he, all the will of God: (whereas it is most certain, that where the Godhead is, especially where the fulness, even all the fulness of the Godhead is, there must be all the Attributes as well as the will of God:) and when he interprets the eternal power to be the promises which shall never fail; and thinks he has sufficiently prov'd it, because the same Apostle calls the Gospel the power of God. For by this way of interpretation no sentence of Scripture can have any certain sense.

We find by the experience of our selves, that some things in this world have a beginning before which they were not; the account of the years of our age sufficiently inferre our natiivities, and they our conceptions, before which we had no being. Now if there be any thing which had a beginning, there must necessarily be something which had no beginning, because nothing can be a beginning to it self. Whatsoever is, must of necessity either have been made, or not made; and something there must needs be which was never made, because all things cannot be made. For whatsoever is made, is made by another, neither can any thing produce it self; otherwise it would follow, that the same thing is and is not at the same instant in the same respect: it is, because a producer; it is not, because to be produced: it is therefore in being, and is not in being; which is a manifest contradiction. If then all things which are made were made by some other, that other which produ-

ced them either was it self produced, or was not : and if not, then have we already an Independent being ; if it were, we must at last come to something which was never made, or else admit either a circle of productions, in which the effect shall make its own cause, or an * infinite succession in causalities, by which nothing will be made : both which are equally impossible. Something then we must confess was never made, something which never had beginning. And although these effects or dependent beings singly considered by themselves do not inferre one supreme cause and maker of them all, yet the admirable order and † connexion of things shew as much ; and this one supreme Cause is *God*. For all things which we see or know have their existence for some end, which no man who considereth the uses and utilities of every Species can deny. Now whatsoever is and hath its being for some end, of that the end for which it is must be thought the cause ; and a final cause is no otherwise the cause of any thing then as it moves the efficient cause to work : from whence we cannot but collect a prime efficient Cause of all things, indued with infinite wisdom, who having a full comprehension of the ends of all, designed, produced, and disposed all things to those ends.

Again, as all things have their existence, so have they also their operations for some * end; and whatsoever worketh so, must needs be directed to it. Although then those creatures which are indued with reason can thereby apprehend the goodness of the end for which they work, and make choice of such means as are proportionable and proper for the obtaining of it, and so by their own counsel direct themselves unto it: yet can we not conceive that other natural agents, whose operations flow from a bare instinct, can be directed in their actions by any counsel of their own. The stone doth not deliberate whether it shall descend, nor doth the wheat take counsel whether it shall grow or no. Even men in natural actions use no act of deliberation: we do not advise how our heart shall beat, though without that pulse we cannot live; when we have provided nutriment for our stomach, we take no counsel how it shall be digested there, or how the chyle distributed to every part for the reparation of the whole; the Mother which conceives taketh no care how that *conceptus* shall be framed, how all the parts shall be distinguished, and by what means or ways the Child shall grow within her womb: and yet all these operations are directed to their proper ends, and that with a greater reason, and therefore by a greater wisdom, than what proceeds from any thing of humane understanding. What then can be more clear, than that those natural agents which work constantly for those ends which they themselves cannot perceive, must be directed by some high and over-ruling Wisdom? and who can be their director in all their operations tending to those ends, but he which gave them their being for those ends? and who is that, but the great Artificer who works in all of them? For Art is so far the imitation of Nature, that if it were not in the Artificer, but † in the thing it self which by Art is framed, the works of Art and Nature would be the same. Were that which frames a Watch within it, and all those curious wheels wrought without the hand of man, it would seem to grow into that form; nor would there be any distinction between the making of that Watch, and the growing of a Plant. Now what the Artificer is to works of Art, who orders and disposes them to other ends than by nature they were made, that is the Maker of all things to all natural agents, directing all their operations to ends which they cannot apprehend; and thus appears the Maker to be the Ruler of the world, * the steerer of this great Ship, the law of this universal Commonwealth, the General of all the hosts of heaven and earth. By these ways, as
by

by the * testimony of the Creature, we come to find an eternal and independent Being, upon which all things else depend, and by which all things else are governed; and this we have before supposed to be the first notion of *God*.

Neither is this any private collection or particular ratiocination, but the publick and universal reason of the world. † No Age so distant, no Countrey so remote, no people so barbarous, but gives a sufficient testimony of this truth. When the *Roman* Eagle flew over most parts of the habitable world, they met with Atheism no-where, but rather by their miscellany Deities at *Rome*, which grew together with their victories, they shewed no Nation was without its God. And since the later Art of Navigation improved hath discovered another part of the world, with which no former commerce hath been known, although the Customs of the people be much different, and their manner of Religion holds small correspondency with any in these parts of the world professed, yet in this all agree, that some religious observances they retain, and a Divinity they acknowledge. Or if any Nation be discovered which maketh no profession of Piety, and exerciseth no religious observances, it followeth not from thence that they acknowledge no God: for they may onely deny his Providence, as the *Epicureans* did; or if any go farther, their numbers are so few, that they must be inconsiderable in respect of mankind. And therefore so much of the *Creed* hath been the general *Confession* of * all Nations, *I believe in God*. Which were it not a most certain truth grounded upon principles obvious unto all, what reason could we give of so universal a consent? or how can it be imagined, that all men should † conspire to deceive themselves and their posterity?

Nor is the reason onely general, and the consent unto it universal, but God hath still preserved and quickened the worship due unto his Name, by the patefaction of himself. Things which are to come are so beyond our knowledge, that the wisest man can but conjecture: and being we are assured of the contingency of future things, and our ignorance of the concurrence of several free causes to the production of an effect, we may be sure that certain and infallible predictions are clear divine patefactions. For none but he who made all things, and gave them power to work, none but he who ruleth all things, and ordereth and directeth all their operations to their ends, none but he upon whose will the actions of all things depend, can possibly be imagined to foresee the effects depending merely on those causes. And therefore by what means we may be assured of a Prophecy, by the same we may be secured of a Divinity. Except then all the Annals of the world were forgeries, and all remarks of History designed to put a cheat upon posterity, we can have no pretence to suspect God's existence, having so ample testimonies of his influence.

The works of nature appear by observation uniform, and there is a certain sphere of every body's power and activity. If then any action be performed which is not within the compass of the power of any natural agent, if any thing be wrought by the intervention of a body which beareth no proportion to it, or hath no natural aptitude so to work, it must be ascribed to a Cause transcending all natural causes, and disposing all their operations. Thus every Miracle proves its authour, and every act of omnipotency is a sufficient demonstration of a Deity. And that man must be possessed with a strange opinion of the weakness of our fathers, and the testimony of all former Ages, who shall deny that ever any Miracle was wrought. *We have heard with our ears, O God, our fathers have told us what works thou didst in their days, in the times of old. Blessed be the Lord God, who onely doth wondrous works.* Psal. 44. 18

Nor are we onely informed by the necessary dependency of all things on God,

* Habet Dominus testimonium totum hoc quod sumus, & in quo sumus.

Total.

† Ἀρχαῖος τις λόγος καὶ πατέρις ὅτι πάντων ἀνθρώπων, ὡς ἐν δεῦν πάντων καὶ ἐν δεῦν ἡμῶν. *Cum sancto. Arist. de Mundo.*

* Nulla gens usquam est adeo contra leges morisque projecta, ut non aliquos Deos credat. *Sen.* † Nec in hunc furorem omnes mortales consentirent, alioquin furda numina & inefficaces Deos. *Sen.*

Rom. 2. 15.

God, as effects upon their universal cause, or his external patefactions unto others, and the consentient acknowledgement of mankind; but every particular person hath a particular Remembrancer in himself, as a sufficient testimony of his Creatour, Lord, and Judge. We know there is a great force of Conscience in all men, by which their *thoughts* are ever *accusing or excusing them*; they feel a comfort in those vertuous actions which they find themselves to have wrought according to their rule, a sting and secret remorse for all vicious acts and impious machinations. Nay those who strive most to deny a God, and to obliterate all sense of a Divinity out of their own Souls, have not been least sensible of this Remembrancer in their breasts. 'Tis true indeed, that a false opinion of God, and a superstitious persuasion which hath nothing of the true God in it, may breed a remorse of Conscience in those who think it true; and therefore some may hence collect that the force of Conscience is onely grounded upon an opinion of a Deity, and that opinion may be false. But if it be a truth, as the testimonies of the wisest Writers of most different persuasions, and experience of all sorts of persons of most various inclinations, do agree, that the remorse of Conscience can never be obliterated, then it rather proveth then supposeth an opinion of a Divinity; and that man which most peremptorily denieth God's existence is the greatest argument himself that there is a God. Let *Caligula* profess himself an Atheist, and with that profession hide his head, or run under his bed, when the thunder strikes his ears, and lightning flashes in his eyes; those terrible works of nature put him in mind of the power, and his own guilt of the justice, of God; whom while in his wilfull opinion he weakly denieth, in his involuntary action he strongly asserteth. So that a Deity will either be granted or extorted, and where it is not acknowledged it will be manifested. Onely unhappy is that man who denies him to himself, and proves him to others; who will not * acknowledge his existence, of whose power he cannot be ignorant. ^a *God is not far from every one of us.* The proper discourse of *S. Paul* to the Philosophers of *Athens* was, that *they might feel after him and find him.* Some Children have been so ungracious as to refuse to give the honour due unto their Parent, but never any so irrational as to deny they had a Father. As for those who have dishonoured God, it may stand most with their interest, and therefore they may wish there were none; but cannot consist with their reason to assert there is none, when even the very Poets of the Heathen have taught us ^b *that we are his off-spring.*

* Hæc est
summa deli-
cti, nolle ag-
noscere quem
ignorare non
possis. *S. Cyp.*
de Idol. Van.
^a *Ast. 17. 27.*

^b *Ast. 17. 28.*

It is necessary thus to believe there is a *God*, First, because there can be no Divine Faith without this belief. For all Faith is therefore onely Divine, because it relieth upon the authority of God giving testimony to the object of it; but that which hath no being can have no Authority, can give no Testimony. The ground of his Authority is his Veracity, the foundations of his Veracity are his Omniscience and Sanctity, both which suppose his essence and existence, because what is not is neither knowing nor holy.

Secondly, it is necessary to believe a Deity, that thereby we may acknowledge such a nature extant as is worthy of, and may justly challenge from us, the highest worship and adoration. For it were vain to be religious and to exercise devotion, except there were a Being to which all such holy applications were most justly due. Adoration implies submission and dejection, so that while we worship we cast down our selves: there must be therefore some great eminence in the object worshipped, or else we should dishonour our own nature in the worship of it. But when a Being is presented of that intrinsecall and necessary perfection, that it depends on nothing, and all things else depend on that, and are wholly governed and disposed by it, this worthily calls us to

our

our knees, and shews the humblest of our devotions to be but just and loyal retributions.

This necessary truth hath been so universally received, that we shall always find all nations of the world more prone unto Idolatry than to Atheism, and readier to multiply than deny the Deity. But our Faith teacheth us equally to deny them both, and each of them are renounced in these words, *I believe in God*. First, *in God* affirmatively, *I believe* he is, against Atheism. Secondly, *in God* exclusively, not in Gods, against Polytheism and Idolatry. Although therefore the *Existence* and *Unity* of God be two distinct truths, yet are they of so necessary dependence and intimate coherence, that both may be expressed by * one word, and included in one † Article.

* Solum Deum confirmas quem tantum Deum nominas. Tertul. de Testim. Anima, c. 2.

When Leo Bi-

shop of Rome in an Epistle to Flavianus had written these words, Fidelium universitas profiteatur credere se in Deum Patrem omnipotentem, & in Jesum Christum filium ejus, one of the Eutychians objected with this Question, Cur non dixerit in unum Deum patrem, & in unum Jesum, juxta Nicæni Decretum Concilii? To which Vigilius, Bishop of Trent, or rather of Tapsus, gives this answer, Sed Romæ & antequam Nicæna Synodus conveniret, à temporibus Apostolorum usque ad nunc, ita fidelibus Symbolum traditur, nec præjudicant verba ubi sensus incolumis permanet: magis enim cum D. J. Christi sententia hæc fidei professio facit dicentis, Creditis in eum, & in me credite; nec dixit in unum Deum Patrem, & in unum me ipsum. Quis enim nesciat unum esse Deum, & unum J. Christum filium ejus? Vigil. l. 4. contr. Eutych. † R. Chasdaï in Or Adonai. R. Joseph Albo in Hikkarim.

And that the Unity of the Godhead is included in this Article is apparent, not onely because the Nicene Council so expressed it by way of exposition, but also because this Creed in the * Churches of the East, before the Council of Nice, had that addition in it, *I believe in one God*. We begin our Creed then as † Plato did his chief and prime Epistles, who gave this distinction to his friends, that the Name of *God* was prefixed before those that were more serious and remarkable, but of *Gods*, in the plural, to such as were more vulgar and trivial. ^a Unto thee it was shewed, saith Moses to Israel, that thou mightest know that the Lord he is God, there is none else beside him. And as the Law, so the Gospel teacheth us the same, ^b We know that an Idol is nothing in the world, and that there is none other God but one. This Unity of the Godhead will easily appear as necessary as the existence, so that it must be as impossible there should be more Gods than one, as that there should be none: which will clearly be demonstrated, first, out of the Nature of God, to which multiplication is repugnant; and, secondly, from the Government as he is Lord, in which we must not admit Confusion.

* Orientales Ecclesie omnes ista tradunt, Credo in unum Deo patre omnipotentem. Ruff. in Symb. Bene hæc omnia pertinent ad solos Hæreticos pertinere, quia falsaverunt Symbolum, dum alter dixerit duos Deos, cum Deus unus sit. Optat. l. 1. Nos enim & scimus, & legimus, & credimus, & tenemus, unum esse Deum, qui fecit cælum pariter ac terram, quoniam nec alterum novimus, nec nolle, cum nullus sit, aliquando poterimus. Novatianus de Trinit. c. 30. And before all these Irenæus, citing under the title of Scripture a passage out of the book of Hermas called Pastor; Bene ergo Scriptura dicit, Primum omnium crede quoniam unus est Deus, qui omnia constituit & consummavit, & fecit ex eo quod non erat, ut essent omnia, omnium capax, & qui à nemine capitur, l. 4. c. 37.

† Euseb. in præp. Evang. the passage is yet extant in the Epistles of Plato. ^a Deut. 4. 35. ^b 1 Cor. 8. 4.

For first, the nature of God consists in this, that he is the prime and original cause of all things, as an independent Being upon which all things else depend, and likewise the ultimate end or final cause of all; but in this sense two prime causes are unimaginable, and for all things to depend of one, and to be more independent beings than one, is a clear contradiction. This primity God requires to be attributed to himself; *Hearken unto me, O Jacob, and Israel my called, I am he, I am the first, I also am the last*. And from this primity he challengeth his Unity; *Thus saith the Lord the King of Israel, and his Redeemer the Lord of hosts, I am the first, and I am the last, and beside me there is no God*.

Again, if there were more Gods than one, then were not all perfections in one, neither formally, by reason of their distinction, nor eminently and virtually, for then one should have power to produce the other, and that nature which is producible is not divine. But all acknowledge God to be absolutely and infinitely perfect, in whom all perfections imaginable which are simply such must

Isa. 43. 12.

44. 6.

must be contained formally, and all others which imply any mixture of imperfection, virtually.

But were no arguments brought from the infinite perfections of the Divine nature able to convince us, yet were the consideration of his supreme Dominion sufficient to persuade us. The will of God is infinitely free, and by that freedome doth he govern and dispose of all things. ^a *He doth according to his will in the army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth*, said Nebuchadnezzar out of his experience; and S. Paul expresseth him as *working all things after the counsel of his own will*. If then there were more supreme Governours of the world then one, each of them absolute and free, they might have contrary determinations concerning the same thing, then which nothing can be more prejudicial unto Government. God is a God of order, not confusion; and therefore of unity, not admitting multiplication. If it be better that the † Universe should be governed by one then many, we may be assured that it is so, because nothing must be conceived of God but what is best. He therefore who made all things, by that right is Lord of all, and because all ^{*} power is his, he alone ruleth over all.

† Τα ὄντα
ἐβέλεται
παραδεδωκεν
αὐτῷ. Οὐκ
ἀγνοῶν
παρακρί-
νῃ, ὡς
κοίτην.
Arist. Me-
taph. l. 12.
c. ult.

* Unus om-
nium Do-
minus est
Deus: ne-
que enim
illa subli-
mitas po-
test habere
consortem,
cum sola
omnem te-
near potesta-
tem. S. Cyp-
r. de Idol. Va-
nit.

אלהוה
אחד
ואינו
שנים
יחד
שנים
אחד
בחד

אחד מן האחדים הנמצאים בעולם לא אחד במין שהוא כולל אחדים רבים: ולא אחד
בגוף שהוא נחלק למחלקות ולקצוות אלא אחד שאין ייחוד אחד נמנית בעולם
one, not two, or more then two, but only One; whose unity is not like to that of the Individuals of this world, neither is he one
by way of Species comprehending many Individuals, neither one in the manner of a body which is divisible into parts and extremes: but
he is so one, as no unity like his is to be found in the world. Moses Maim. de Fundam. Legis. Quod autem diximus, Orientis Ec-
clesias tradere unum Patrem Omnipotentem, & unum Dominum, hoc modo intelligendum est, unum non numero dici, sed uni-
versitate: verbi gratia, si quis dicat unum hominem, aut unum equum, hic unum pro numero posuit, potest enim & alius homo
esse, & ceterius, vel equus. Ubi autem secundus & tertius non potest jungi, unus si dicatur, non numeri, sed universitatis est no-
men. Ut si exempli causa dicamus unum Solem, hic unus ita dicitur ut alius vel tertius addi non possit; multo magis Deus
cum unus dicitur, unus non numeri, sed universitatis vocabulo nuncupatur, id est, qui propterea unus dicatur, quod alius non sit.
Ruffin. in Synb. ^b Isa. 45. 5, 6. Deut. 4. 35. and 32. 39. Psal. 18. 31. ^c Isa. 45. 18, 21, 22. and 44. 8. ^d John 17. 3.
* Veritas Christiana districte pronuntiavit, Deus si non unus est, non est, quia dignius credimus non esse, quodcumque non ita
fuerit ut esse debeat. Tertul. adv. Marcion. l. 1. c. 2. Deus cum summum magnum sit, recte veritas nostra pronuntiavit, Deus si
non unus est, non est. Non quasi dubitemus esse Deum, dicendo, si non unus, non est Deus; sed quia, quem confidimus esse,
idem definiamus esse, quod si non est Deus, non est, summum scilicet magnum. Porro summum magnum unicum sit necesse est,
ergo & Deus unicus erit non aliter Deus nisi summum magnum, nec aliter summum magnum nisi parem non habens, nec aliter
parem non habens nisi unicus fuerit. Ibid.

It is necessary thus to believe the Unity of the Godhead, that being assured there is a nature worthy of our devotions, and challenging our religious sub-
jection,

jection, we may learn to know whose that nature is to which we owe our adorations, lest our minds should wander and fluctuate in our worship about various and uncertain objects. If we should apprehend more Gods than one, I know not what could determinate us in any instant to the actual adoration of any one: for where no difference doth appear, (as, if there were many, and all by nature Gods, there could be none) what inclination could we have, what reason could we imagine, to preferre or elect any one before the rest for the object of our devotions? Thus is it necessary to believe the Unity of God in respect of us who are obliged to worship him.

Secondly, it is necessary to believe the Unity of God in respect of him who is to be worshipped. Without this acknowledgement we cannot give unto God the things which are Gods, it being part of the worship and honour due unto God, to accept of no compartner with him. When the Law was given, in the observance whereof the Religion of the *Israelites* consisted, the first precept was this prohibition, *Thou shalt have no other gods before me*; and who-soever violateth this, denieth the foundation on which all the rest depend, as the * *Jews* observe. This is the true reason of that strict precept by which all are commanded to give divine worship to God onely, *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him onely shalt thou serve*; because he alone is God: him onely shalt thou fear, because he alone hath infinite power; in him onely shalt thou trust, because *he onely is our rock and our salvation*; to him alone shalt thou direct thy devotions, because *he onely knoweth the hearts of the children of men*. Upon this foundation the whole heart of man is intirely required of him, and engaged to him. Hear, O *Israel, the Lord our God is one God*: And (or rather, *Therefore*) *thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might*. Whosoever were truly and by nature God, could not chuse but challenge our love upon the ground of an infinite excellency, and transcendent beauty of holiness: and therefore if there were more so Gods than one, our love must necessarily be terminated unto † more than one, and consequently divided between them; and as our love, so also the proper effect thereof, our chearfull and ready obedience, which, like the Child propounded to the judgement of *Solomon*, as soon as 'tis divided, is destroyed. ^b *No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other.*

Exod. 20. 3.

* *Moses Maimon. de Fund. legis, c. 3.*† *Matt. 4. 10.*

Psal. 62. 2.

2 Chron. 6. 30.

Deut. 6. 4, 5.

† *Numerus divinitatis summâ ratione constare deberet, vel*

quoniam & cultura ejus in anceps deduceretur. Ecce enim, duos intuens Deos tam pares quàm duo summa magna, quid facerem si ambos colerem? vereretur ne abundantia officii superstitio potius quàm religio crederetur: quia duos tam pares & in altero ambo possem in uno demereri: hoc ipso testimonium præstans parilitati & unitati eorum, dum alterum in altero venerarer, dum in uno mihi duo sunt. Tertul. adv. Marcion. l. 1. c. 5. ^b *Matth. 6. 24.*

Having thus described the first *notion* of a *God*, having demonstrated the *Existence* and *Unity* of that *God*, and having in these three particulars comprised all which can be contained in this part of the Article, we may now clearly deliver, and every particular Christian understand, what it is he says when he makes his *Confession* in these words, *I believe in God*; which in correspondence with the precedent discourse may be thus exprest:

Forasmuch as by all things created is made known the *eternal power and Godhead*, and the dependency of all limited Beings inferrs an infinite and independent essence; whereas all things are for some end, and all their operations directed to it, although they cannot apprehend that end for which they are, and in prosecution of which they work, and therefore must be guided by some universal and over-ruling wisdom; being this collection is so evident, that all the Nations of the earth have made it; being God hath not onely written himself in the lively characters of his Creatures, but hath also made frequent patefactions of his Deity by most infallible predictions and super-

E

natural

natural operations; therefore I fully assent unto, freely acknowledge, and clearly profess this truth, that *there is a God*.

Again, being a prime and independent Being supposeth all other to depend, and consequently no other to be God; being the intire fountain of all perfections is incapable of a double Head, and the most perfect government of the Universe speaks the supreme dominion of one absolute Lord; hence do I acknowledge that God to be but one, and in this Unity or rather singularity of the Godhead, excluding all actual or possible multiplication of a Deity, *I believe in God*.

I Believe in God the FATHER.

Eph. 4. 6.
1 Cor. 8. 6.

After the Confession of a Deity, and assertion of the Divine Unity, the next Consideration is concerning God's Paternity; for that *one God is Father of all, and to us there is but one God, the Father*.

* Omnem
Deum qui ab
homine colitur
neceffe
est inter so-
lennes ritus

Now, although the Christian notion of the divine Paternity be some way peculiar to the Evangelical patefaction; yet *wheresoever God hath been acknowledged, he hath been understood and worshipped as a *Father*: the very Heathen † Poets so describe their Gods, and their vulgar names did carry *father* * in them, as the most popular and universal notion.

& precesiones Patrem nuncupari; non tantum honoris gratia, sed & rationis, & quod antiquior est homine, & quod vitam, salutem, victum præstat ut pater. Itaque & Jupiter à precantibus Pater vocatur, & Saturnus, & Janus, & Liber, & ceteri deinceps. Laſſan. de ver. Sap. l. 4. c. 3. † That so frequent in Homer, *πατήρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε* eundemque appellans dicit Ennius, *Divumque hominumque pater rex*. Varr. de L. L. l. 4. as Servius observes of Virgil, à Poëta penè omnibus Diis nomen patrum additur, ut fiant venerabiliores: and before him Lucilius,

Ut nemo sit nostrum quin pater optimus Divum,
Ut Neptunus pater, Liber, Saturnus pater, Mars,
Janus, Quirinus pater nomen dicatur ad unum. Laſſan. iò.

* As Jupiter, which is Jovis pater, or *Ζεῦ πάτερ*, otherwise Diespiter, or *Διὸς πάτερ* and Marspiter, of whom Servius, apud Pontifices Marspiter dicitur, *Æneid. l. 3*. So Semipater for Semo, and *Σαρδῶν πάτερ* for Sardus, the proper Deity of Sardinia, Ptolem.

Gen. 2. 4.

This name of *Father* is a Relative; and the proper foundation of Paternity, as of a Relation, is Generation. As therefore the phrase of generating is diversly attributed unto several acts of the same nature with Generation properly taken, or by consequence attending on it: so the title of *Father* is given unto divers persons or things, and for several reasons unto the same God. *These are the Generations of the heavens and the earth, when they were created, in the day that the Lord God made the earth and the heavens, saith Moses*. So that the creation or production of any thing by which it is, and before was not, is a kind of generation, and consequently the

Job 38. 28.

Creatour or Producer of it a kind of *Father*. *Hath the rain a Father? or who hath begotten the drops of dew?* By which words Job signifies, that as there is no other cause assignable of the Rain but God, so may he as the cause be called the *Father* of it, though not in the most proper sense, * as

* Ἐτέρος
γὰρ τις υἱὸς
πατέρα διδόν
ἀκούει, καὶ ἐτε-
ρος υἱός. Se-
rvius in Job.

† Plutarch
of Plato,
calling God

πατέρα πάν-
των καὶ ποιη-
τήν, says, τὴν
μεταφορὰν
χρησάμενος,

ὡς αὐτὸς εἰπὼς, τὸν αἰῶνα πατέρα τοῦ κόσμου καλεῖται. Platon. *Quest. Ad Alcimus*, πατὴρ δὲ ἐστὶ τὸ αἶπθ' ἢ πάντων.

* 1 Cor. 8. 6.

tional

tional agents he is * the Creatour, of rational, as so, the *Father* also; they are his Creatures, these his Sons. Hence he is styled the *Father of Spirits*, and the blessed Angels, when he laid the foundations of the earth, his Sons; *When the morning-stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy*: hence Man, whom he created after his own image, is called his *off-spring*, and *Adam*, the immediate work of his hands, *the son of God*: hence may we all cry out with the *Israelites* taught by the Prophet so to speak, *Have we not all one Father? hath not one God created us?* Thus the first and most universal Notion of God's Paternity in a borrowed or metaphorical sense is founded rather upon Creation than Procreation.

αὐτοῦ Father of Gods and men, Maker of things inanimate and irrational. *ὁ ὅς ποτε οὐκ ἔστιν πατήρ καὶ ἀνθρώπων* & πατὴρ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, καὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων. Non enim agri pater, si Chryippo credimus, is dicitur qui cum conseruit, quam ē semine deinde fruges nascantur: as the *Latine Translation* most absurdly. For there is neither corn nor field, nor any seed belonging to them, in the words of Plutarch: But *ἄλλος* (not *ἄλλος*) is the *Secunda*, the coat (or rather coats, in the acception of Chrysippus and the language of those times) in which the Fœtus is involved in the mother's womb. Though therefore both the *Secunda* and the Fœtus be made of the seed of the male in the Philosophy of Chrysippus, yet he is not called the father of the after-birth, but of the child; the one being endued with life and reason, and the other not. ^a Heb. 12. 9. ^b Job 38. 7. ^c Acts 17. 28. ^d Luke 3. 38: ^e Malach. 2. 10.

Unto this act of Creation is annexed that of Conservation, by which God doth uphold and preserve in being that which at first he made, and to which he gave its Being. As therefore it is the duty of the Parent to educate and preserve the Child, as that which had its Being from him; so this paternal education doth give the name of * *Father* unto Man, and Conservation gives the same to God.

Again, Redemption from a state of misery, by which a people hath become worse then nothing, unto a happy condition, is a kind of *Generation*, which joyned with love, care, and indulgence in the Redeemer, is sufficient to found a new *Paternity*, and give him another title of a *Father*. Well might *Moses* tell the people of *Israel*, now brought out of the land of *Egypt* from their brick and straw, unto their Quails and Manna, unto their milk and honey, *Is not he thy Father that hath bought thee? hath he not made thee, and established thee?* Well might God speak unto the same people as to ^b his son, even ^c his first-born, ^d Thus saith the Lord thy Redeemer, and he that formed thee from ^e the womb; Harken unto me, O house of Jacob, and all the remnant of the house of *Israel*, which are born by me from the belly, which are carried from the womb. And just is the acknowledgement made by that people instructed by the Prophet, ^d Doubtless thou art our Father, though Abraham be ignorant of us, and *Israel* acknowledge us not; thou, O Lord, art our Father, our Redeemer, from everlasting is thy Name. And thus another kind of paternal Relation of God unto the sons of men is founded on a Restitution or temporal Redemption.

Besides, if to be born causeth a Relation to a *Father*, then to be born again maketh an addition of another: and if to generate foundeth, then to regenerate addeth a *Paternity*. Now though we cannot enter the second time into our mother's womb, nor pass through the same door into the Scene of life again; yet we believe and are persuaded that *except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God*. A double birth there is, and the [†] world consists of two, the first and the second man. And though the incorruptible seed be the Word of God, and the Dispensers of it in some sense may say, as *S. Paul* spake unto the *Corinthians*, ^f I have begotten you through the Gospel: yet he is the true Father, whose Word it is, and that is God, even ^g the Father of lights, who of his own will begat us with the word of truth. Thus ^h whosoever believeth that *Jesus is the Christ*, is born of God; which Regeneration is as it were a second Creation: ⁱ for we are God's workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works. And he alone who did create us out of nothing, can beget us again, and make

* So Plutarch answers the Question, why Plato terms God the Maker and Father of all things.

^a H. ἄλλος ὅς ποτε οὐκ ἔστιν πατήρ καὶ ἀνθρώπων, καὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων.

^b H. ὁ ὅς ποτε οὐκ ἔστιν πατήρ καὶ ἀνθρώπων, καὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων.

^c H. ὁ ὅς ποτε οὐκ ἔστιν πατήρ καὶ ἀνθρώπων, καὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων.

^d H. ὁ ὅς ποτε οὐκ ἔστιν πατήρ καὶ ἀνθρώπων, καὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων.

^e H. ὁ ὅς ποτε οὐκ ἔστιν πατήρ καὶ ἀνθρώπων, καὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων.

^f H. ὁ ὅς ποτε οὐκ ἔστιν πατήρ καὶ ἀνθρώπων, καὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων.

^g H. ὁ ὅς ποτε οὐκ ἔστιν πατήρ καὶ ἀνθρώπων, καὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων.

^h H. ὁ ὅς ποτε οὐκ ἔστιν πατήρ καὶ ἀνθρώπων, καὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων.

ⁱ H. ὁ ὅς ποτε οὐκ ἔστιν πατήρ καὶ ἀνθρώπων, καὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων.

[†] H. ὁ ὅς ποτε οὐκ ἔστιν πατήρ καὶ ἀνθρώπων, καὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων.

[†] H. ὁ ὅς ποτε οὐκ ἔστιν πατήρ καὶ ἀνθρώπων, καὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων.

[†] H. ὁ ὅς ποτε οὐκ ἔστιν πατήρ καὶ ἀνθρώπων, καὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων.

^a Gen. 30. 1, 2. us of the new Creation. When Rachel called to Jacob, ^a Give me children or else I die; he answered her sufficiently with this question, *Am I in God's stead?* And if he onely openeth the womb, who else can make the ^{*} Soul to bear? Hence hath he the name of *Father*, and they of *Sons* who are born of him; and so from that internall act of spiritual Regeneration another title of Paternity redoundeth unto the Divinity.

Nor is this the onely second birth or sole Regeneration in a Christian sense; the Soul, which after its natural Being requires a birth into the life of Grace, is also after that born again into a life of Glory. Our Saviour puts us in mind of the Regeneration, ^b when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory. The Resurrection of our bodies is a kind of coming out of the womb of the earth, and entring upon immortality, a nativity into another life. For ^c they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, are the sons of God, being the sons of the Resurrection; and then, as sons; ^d they become heirs, coheirs with Christ, ^{*} receiving the promise and reward of eternal inheritance. ^e Beloved, now we are the sons of God, saith S. John, even in this life by Regeneration, and it doth not yet appear, or, it hath not been yet made manifest, what we shall be; but we know, that if he appear, we shall be like him: the manifestation of the Father being a sufficient declaration of the condition of the Sons, when the Sonship it self consisteth in a similitude of the Father. And ^f blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which according to his abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a lively hope, by the Resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead; To an inheritance incorruptible and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for us. Why may not then a second kind of Regeneration be thought a fit addition of this paternall relation?

Neither is there onely a natural, but also a voluntary and civil, foundation of Paternity: for the Laws have found a way by which a man may become a Father without procreation: and this imitation of [†] nature is called Adoption, taken in the general ^{*} signification. Although therefore many ways God be a Father, yet lest any way might seem to exclude us from being his Sons, he hath made us so also by Adoption. Others are wont to fly to this, as to a comfort of their solitary condition, when either [†] Nature hath denied them, or death bereft them of their off-spring. Whereas God doth it not for his own, but for our sakes; nor is the advantage his, but ours. ^g Behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God; that we, the sons of disobedient and condemned Adam by natural generation, should be translated into the glorious liberty of the sons of God by Adoption; that we, who were aliens, strangers and enemies, should be assumed ^h unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, on whom all the ^{*} family of heaven and earth is named, and be made partakers of ⁱ the riches of the glory of his inheritance in the Saints. For as in the legal Adoption, the Father hath as [†] full and absolute power over his adopted son as over his own issue; so in the spiritual, the adopted sons have a clear and undoubted right of inheri-

† Cui Inft. 1.

t. 5. 5. 1.

Adoptio nat-

tura simili-

tudo est, ut

aliquis filium

habere possit,

quem non

generavit.

† Cui Inft. 1.

t. 5. 5. 1.

Adoptio nat-

tura simili-

tudo est, ut

aliquis filium

habere possit,

quem non

generavit.

† Cui Inft. 1.

t. 5. 5. 1.

Adoptio nat-

tura simili-

tudo est, ut

aliquis filium

habere possit,

quem non

generavit.

† Cui Inft. 1.

t. 5. 5. 1.

Adoptio nat-

tura simili-

tudo est, ut

aliquis filium

habere possit,

quem non

generavit.

† Cui Inft. 1.

t. 5. 5. 1.

Adoptio nat-

tance.

tance. He then who hath ^a *predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself*, hath thereby another kind of paternal relation, and so we receive the ^b *Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father.*

The necessity of this faith in God as in our Father appeareth, first, in that it is the ground of all our filial fear, honour and obedience due unto him upon this relation. ^c *Honour thy Father is the first Commandment with promise*, written in tables of stone with the finger of God; and, *Children obey your parents in the Lord*, is an Evangelical precept, but founded upon principles of reason and justice; for *this is right*, saith S. Paul. And if there be such a rational and legal obligation of honour and obedience to the fathers of our flesh, how much more must we think our selves obliged to him whom we believe to be our heavenly and everlasting Father? ^d *A son honoureth his father, and a servant his master. If then I be a father, where is my honour? and if I be a master, where is my fear? saith the Lord of hosts.* If we be heirs, we must be co-heirs with Christ; if sons, we must be brethren to the onely-begotten: but being he came not to doe his own will, but the will of him that sent him, he acknowledgeth no fraternity but with such as doe the same; as he hath said, ^e *Whosoever shall doe the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother.* If it be required of a Bishop in the Church of God, to be ^f *one that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity*; what obedience must be due, what subjection must be paid, unto the Father of the family?

The same Relation in the Object of our Faith is the life of our devotions, the expectation of all our petitions. Christ, who taught his disciples, and us in them, how to pray, propounded not the knowledge of God, though without that he could not hear us; neither represented he his power, though without that he cannot help us; but comprehended all in this Relation, ^g *When ye pray, say, Our Father.* This prevents all vain repetitions of our most earnest desires, and gives us full security to cut off all tautology; for ^h *our Father knoweth what things we have need of before we ask him.* This creates a clear assurance of a grant without mistake of our petition: ⁱ *What man is there of us, who if his son ask bread, will give him a stone? or if he ask fish, will give him a serpent? If we then who are evil know how to give good gifts unto our children; how much more shall our Father which is in heaven give good things to them that ask him?*

Again, this *paternity* is the proper foundation of our Christian patience, sweetning all afflictions with the name and nature of fatherly corrections. ^k *We have had fathers of our flesh which corrected us, and we gave them reverence: shall we not much rather be in subjection to the Father of spirits, and live? especially considering that they chastened us after their own pleasure; but He for our profit, that we might be partakers of his holiness:* they, as an argument of their authority; He, as an assurance of his love: they, that we might acknowledge them to be our Parents; He, that he may persuade us that we are his Sons: *For whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth.* And what greater incitement unto the exercise of patience is imaginable unto a suffering soul, then to see in every stroke the hand of a Father, in every affliction a demonstration of his love? Or how canst thou repine, or be guilty of the least degree of impatience, even in the sharpest corrections, if ^l *thou shalt know with thine heart, that as a man chasteneth his son, so the Lord thy God chasteneth thee?* How canst thou not be comforted, and even rejoyce in the midst of thy greatest sufferings, when thou knowest that he which striketh pitieth, he which afflicteth is as it were afflicted with it? ^m *for like as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear him.*

^a Eph. i. 5.^b Rom. 8. 15.^c Eph. 6. 1, 2.^d Malac. i. 6.^e Matt. 12. 50.^f 1 Tim. 3. 4.^g Luk. 11. 2.^h Matt. 6. 8.ⁱ Matt. 7. 9, 10, 11.^j Matt. 7. 9, 10, 11.^k Heb. 12. 9, 10.^l Deut. 8. 5.^m Psal. 103. 13.

* Πάν τὸ
ἡνῶν ὁμοίον
αὐτοῦ ἡνῶν
Epiph. Hæc.
76. 6.

† Τὸ ὁμοίον
ἡνῶν πῶς
ἡνῶνται τὰ
ἡνῶν, ὁλο-
γόν. Aristot.
de Generat.
Animal. l. 1.
c. 9.

* Fortes cre-
antur fortibus
& bonis.
Est in juven-
cis, est in e-
quis patrum
Virtus, nec
imbellem fe-
roces Proge-
nerant aquila
colum-
bam. Hor.
Ode.

* Gen. 5. 3.

* Ephes. 5. 1.
μῦτον. Filii
hominum
sunt, quando

male faciunt; quando bene, filii Dei. S. Aug. in Psal. 52. * Lev. 11. 44. and 19. 2. and 20. 7. * 1 Pet. 1. 15. * Matt. 5: 44, 45. Vide S. Aug. in Psal. 100. * Luke 6. 36. Similitudinem patris actus indicent sobolis; similitudo operis similitudinem indicet generis: actus nomen confirmet, ut nomen genus demonstrat. Aug. de Temp. Sermon. 76.

Lastly, the same Relation strongly inferreth an absolute necessity of our imitation; it being clearly vain to assume the title of Son without any similitude of the Father. What is the * general notion of Generation but the production of the like; Nature, ambitious of perpetuity, striving to preserve the species in the multiplication and succession of individuals? And this similitude consisteth partly in essentials, or the likeness of nature; partly in accidentals, or the likeness in † figure, or * affections. * Adam begat a son in his own likeness, after his image: and can we imagine those the sons of God which are no way like him? A similitude of nature we must not, of figure we cannot pretend unto: it remains then onely that we bear some likeness in our actions and affections. * Be ye therefore followers, saith the Apostle, or rather imitators, of God, as dear children. What he hath revealed of himself, that we must express within our selves. Thus God spake unto the children of Israel, whom he styled his Son, * *Ye shall be holy, for I am holy.* And the Apostle upon the same ground speaketh unto us, as to obedient children, * *As he that hath called you is holy, so be ye holy in all manner of conversation.* It is part of the general beneficence and universal goodness of our God, that * *he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust.* These impartial beams and undistinguishing showers are but to shew us what we ought to doe, and to make us fruitfull in the works of God; for no other reason Christ hath given us this command, * *Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, doe good to them that hate you, that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven.* No other command did he give upon this ground, but, * *Be ye therefore mercifull, as your Father is mercifull.*

So necessary is this faith in God as in our Father, both for direction to the best of actions, and for consolation in the worst of conditions.

But although this be very necessary, yet is it not the principal or most proper explication of God's Paternity. For as we find one person in a more peculiar manner the Son of God; so must we look upon God as in a more peculiar manner the Father of that Son. * *I ascend unto my Father, and your Father,* saith our Saviour; the same of both, but in a different manner, denoted by the Article prefixed before the one, and not the other: which distinction in the original we may preserve by this translation, *I ascend unto the Father of me, and Father of you*; first of me, and then of you: not therefore his, because ours; but therefore ours, because his. So far we are the sons of God, as we are like unto him; and our similitude unto God consisteth in our conformity to the likeness of his Son. * *For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the first-born among many brethren.* He the first-born, and we sons, as brethren unto him: he * *appointed heir of all things, and we heirs of God, as joynt-heirs with him.* Thus God * *sent forth his Son, that we might receive the adoption of Sons.* And because we are Sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, *Abba, Father.* By his mission are we adopted, and by his Spirit call we God our Fa-

* Joh. 20. 17.
ἀναβαίνα
πρὸς τὸν πα-
τέρα μου, καὶ
πατέρα ὑ-
μῶν. Had
πατέρα in
both places
had its arti-
cle, there
would have
seemed two
Fathers: had
the article
been prefixed
to πατέρα ὑ-
μῶν, he would
have seemed
first ours, then
Christ's: but
being prefixed
to πατέρα
μου, it shewes

God to be principally and originally Christ's, and by our reference unto him, our Father. Πατέρα μου καὶ ὑμῶν ἐν τῇ θεότητι, καὶ πατέρα ὑμῶν διὰ χάριν ἐν τῇ υιοθεσίᾳ. Epiphanius. Hæres. 69. §. 55. καὶ εἰπὼν, πρὸς τὸν πατέρα ὑμῶν ἀλλὰ διεκλῶν, καὶ εἰπὼν πρὸς τὸν οἰκεῖον, πρὸς τὸν πατέρα μου, ὅσο ὡς κατὰ φύσιν· εἰτ' ἐπαγαγὼν καὶ πατέρα ὑμῶν, ὅσο ὡς κατὰ θεότητα. S. Cyril. Catech. 7. * Ἐτέρος ἐστὶν αὐτὸς πατήρ, καὶ ἐτέρος ἡμεῶν; πάντες ὡς οὗν. εἰ γὰρ τῶν διγίων ἐτέρος θεὸς καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀνθρώπων, πολλὰ μάλλον οὕτως ἢ ἡμεῶν. * Ἐπειδὴν γὰρ εἶπε, Εἰπὴ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, ἵνα μὴ ἀπὸ τέτου ἴσον πνεύματος δέχουσι τὸ ἐκκλησιαστικόν. S. Chrysost. ad locum. * Rom. 8. 29. * Heb. 1. 2. * Gal. 4. 4, 5, 6. Hoc facit Deus ex filiis hominum filios Dei, quia ex filio Dei fecit Deus filium hominis. S. Aug. in Psal. 52.

ther.

* Arius and Eusebius, in their Creed delivered to Constantine: Ταύτην τὴν πίστιν παρέλαβον ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ δόγματι, ἀρχαίων, ἀκούοντες τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ τῶν ἐπισκόπων, Ποσειδώντος μαθητεύσαντες πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ πατρὸς, καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ, καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος. Socrat. l. 1. c. 26. And upon the exhibiting this Confession of Faith, they were restored to the Communion of the Church by the Synod of Jerusalem. Socrat. l. 2. c. 27. In the same manner Eusebius delivered his Creed unto the Council of Nice, concluding and deducing it from the same Text, καὶ δὲ τὸ ὅνομα τῶν ἁγίων, ἀκούοντες τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ τῶν ἐπισκόπων, Ποσειδώντος μαθητεύσαντες, &c. Socrat. l. 1. c. 8. Theodor. l. 1. c. 12. The same is also alledged by the Council of Antioch, under the Emperor Constantius and Pope Julius. Socrat. l. 2. c. 10. Vide S. Athanas. in Epist. ad univ. Orthodox. Orat. contra Gregor. Sabellii, & contra Arianos, ex Deo Deus. Vide Basil. de Sp. S. So Vigil. Tapsensis Dial. l. 1. makes Arius and Athanasius joyfully speak these words: Credimus in Deum Patrem Omnipotentem, & in Jesum Christum Filium ejus, Dominum nostrum, & in Spiritum S. Hæc est fidei nostræ Regula, quam cœlesti magisterio Dominus tradidit Apostolis, dicens, Ite, Baptizate, &c.

* Act. 8. 36, 37. ^b Verse 12. ^c Act. 2. 38. and 8. 16. and 10. 48. and 19. 5.

them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the holy Ghost. From this sacred form of Baptism did the Church derive the * Rule of Faith, requiring the profession of belief in the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, before they could be baptized in their Name. When the Eunuch asked Philip, ^a What doth hinder me to be baptized? Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest: And when the Eunuch replied, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God; he baptized him. And before that, the Samaritans, ^b when they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, were baptized, both men and women. For as in the Acts of the Apostles there is no more expressed then that they baptized ^c in the name of Jesus Christ: so is no more expressed of the Faith required in them who were to be baptized, then to believe in the same Name. But being the Father and the Holy Ghost were likewise mentioned in the first Institution, being the expressing of one doth not exclude the other, being it is certain that from the Apostles times the names of all three were used; hence upon the same ground was required Faith, and a profession of belief in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Again, as the Eunuch said not simply, I believe in the Son, but, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, as a brief explication of that part of the Institution which he had learned before of Philip: so they who were converted unto Christianity were first taught not the bare names, but the explications and descriptions of them in a brief, easie and familiar way; which when they had rendred, acknowledged, and professed, they were baptized in them. And these being regularly and constantly used, made up the Rule of Faith, that is, the Creed. The truth of which may sufficiently be made apparent to any who shall seriously consider the constant practice of the Church, from the first Age unto this present, of delivering the Rule of Faith to those which were to be baptized, and so requiring of themselves, or their Sureties, an express recitation, profession, or acknowledgement of the Creed. From whence this observation is properly deduceable; That in what sense the name of Father is taken in the Form of Baptism, in the same it also ought to be taken in this Article. And being nothing can be more clear then that, when it is said, In the name of the Father, and of the Son, the notion of Father hath in this particular no other relation but to that Son whose name is joyned with his; and as we are baptized into no other Son of that Father, but that onely-begotten Christ Jesus, so into no other Father, but the Father of that onely-begotten: it followeth, that the proper explication of the first words of the Creed is this, I believe in God the Father of Christ Jesus.

In vain then is that vulgar distinction applied unto the explication of the Creed, whereby the Father is considered both personally, and essentially: personally, as the first in the glorious Trinity, with relation and opposition to the Son; essentially, as comprehending the whole Trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. For that the Son is not here comprehended in the Father is evident, not onely out of the original, or occasion, but also from the very letter of the Creed, which teacheth us to believe in God the Father, and in his Son; for if the Son were included in the Father, then were the Son the Father of himself. As therefore when I say, I believe in Jesus Christ his Son, I must necessarily understand the Son of that Father whom I mentioned in the first Article; so

That God is the proper and eternal Father of his own eternal Son is now declared: what is the eminency or excellency of this Relation followeth to be considered. In general then we may safely observe, that in the very * name of Father there is something of eminence which is not in that of Son; and some kind of priority we must ascribe unto him whom we call the first, in respect of him whom we term the second Person: and as we cannot but ascribe it, so must we endeavour to † preserve it.

Now that privilege or * priority consisteth not in this, that the essence or attributes of the one are greater then the essence or attributes of the other; (for we shall hereafter demonstrate them to be the same in both) but onely in this, that the Father hath that essence of himself, the Son by communication from the Father. From whence he acknowledgeth that he is ^a from him, that he ^b liveth by him, that the ^c Father gave him to have life in himself, and generally referreth all things to him, as received from him. Wherefore in this sense some of the Ancients have not stuck to interpret those words, ^d the Father is greater then I, of Christ as the Son of God, as the second Person in the blessed Trinity; but still with reference not unto his Essence, but his Generation, by which he is understood to have his Being from the Father, who onely hath it of himself, and is the original of all power and essence in the Son. ^e I can of mine own self doe nothing, saith our Saviour, † because he is not of himself; and whosoever receives his Being, must receive his power from another, especially where the essence and the power are undeniably the same, as in God they are. ^f The Son then can doe nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father doe, because he hath no * power of himself, but what the Father gave:

* Αυτό το
ὄνομα τὸ πα-
τρὸς μείζον
ἐστὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ.
Syn. Savid.
Theodor. l. 2.
c. 8. Insinua-
tur nobis in
Patre autori-
tas, in filio
nativitas. S.
August.
† Τὸ μὲν
ἀρχόντων,
πατεὶ δὲ
ἐν αἰῶμα
φιλανθρώπου,
μὴ δὲ αὐτῶ
αἰώνων ἀνι-
σταί. Alexand.
apud Theodo-
r. l. 1. c. 4.
* Ὡς ὁ
κατὰ τὸ πῶ
τὸν αἰῶνα
πρὸς τὸ ἐξ
αὐτῶν ὁ
πρῶτος
χρῆμα τὸ
πατὴρ φα-
νερὸν, κατὰ
τὸ

τῆς φύσεως διαφορῶν ἕκαστος. S. Basil. contra Eunom. l. 1. * John 7. 29. ^b John 6. 57. ^c John 5. 26. ^d John 14. 28. μεί-
ζων, εἶπεν, ἡ μὲν γὰρ πρὸς τὸν υἱὸν, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸ πῶς αὐτὸς τὸν πατέρα ἔχει. S. Athanas. contra Arianos l. 2. Δεῖται τοῦ
πῶς κατὰ τὸν τῆς αἰῶνος λόγον ἐστὶν αὐτῶν τὸ μείζον λόγος, ἐπεὶ δὲ τὸ πῶς πατὴρ ἢ υἱὸς κατὰ τὸ πῶς ὁ πατὴρ ὡς
αἶψα τὸ ἀρχὴ, διὰ τὸ καὶ αὐτὸς εἶπεν, Ὁ πατὴρ μὴ μείζων μὲν ἐστὶ, καὶ δὲ πατὴρ διλογεῖται. τὸ δὲ πατὴρ τί ἄλλο σημαίνει, ἢ ὅτι τὸ
αἰτία ἔστι καὶ ἀρχὴ τῆς αὐτῆς ὑποστάσεως; S. Basil. contra Eunom. l. 1. And the same S. Basil doth not onely acknowledge this to
be true in respect of the Divine Nature of Christ, but thinketh the Divinity of the Son may be proved from hence. Ἐρῶ δὲ ὅτι ἐν ταῖς
τῆς φύσεως, τὸ δὲ μείζον ἐστὶ τὸν υἱὸν τὸν πατέρα διλογεῖται. τὰς δὲ συγκατάθεσις οὐκ αὐτῶς ἐπὶ τῶν τῆς αὐτῆς φύσεως γνο-
μῶν ἀγγέλον τὸ ἀρχὴν λόγον μείζονα, καὶ ἀνθρώπων ἀνθρώπων δικαιοτέραν, καὶ πρὸς πλὴν ταχύτεραν. εἰ τοῦτο αἰ συγκα-
τεσις ἐπὶ τῶν ὁμοιωδῶν γίνονται, μείζον δὲ κατὰ συγκατάθεσιν οὐκ ὁ πατὴρ τὸν υἱὸν ὁμοῦ καὶ τὸν πατέρα ὁ υἱὸς. Ad Casariensis Ep. 141.
τὸ μείζον μὲν ἐστὶ τὸν αἰῶνα, τὸ δὲ ἵσον τῆς φύσεως. Nazianz. Orat. 36. & Orat. 40. ὅτι κατὰ τὸ πῶς ὁ υἱὸς τὸν πατέρα, κατὰ τὸν αἰῶνα
μὴ. Vide Epiph. in Ancor. c. 17. εἰ δὲ λέγει τις μείζονα ἐστὶν τὸν πατέρα καὶ αἶψα τὸν υἱὸν, ὅτι τὸν αἰῶνα μὴ. S. Chrys. Homil.
in Joan. 75. ἵσον τοῦ πατρὸς κατὰ τὸν τῆς φύσεως λόγον ὑπάρχον ὁ υἱὸς τὸν πατέρα, καὶ ὁμοῦ κατὰ πάντα, μείζονα αὐτὸν φησὶν ὡς
ἀνθρώπων, ἔχον ἀρχὴν κατὰ τὸν αἰῶνα τὸν υἱὸν τὸν πατέρα, καὶ αἶψα τὸν υἱὸν τὸν πατέρα ὑπάρχον ἐκεῖ. S. Cyril. Theol. l. 1. And Isidore Pelu-
sota Ep. 334. l. 3. cites this saying of an ancient Father: Καὶ τὸ μείζον ἵσαται ἡ ὑποστάσις, καὶ τὸ ἵσον καὶ ὁ υἱὸς καὶ ὁμοῦ καὶ ὁμοῦ. So
Vigilius professes to believe the Son æqualem per omnia Patri, excepto eo quod ille ingenuus est, & iste genitus. De Trinit. l. 11.
Ideo totum quod habet, quod potest, non tribuit sibi, sed Patri, quia non est à seipso, sed à Patre. Æqualis est enim Patri, sed
hoc quoque accepit à Patre. S. August. Epist. 66. Necesse est quodammodo prior sit, quia Pater sit; quoniam antecedit necesse
est cum qui habet originem, ille qui originem nescit. Simul ut hic minor sit, dum in illo esse se scit, habens originem, quia
nascitur. Novatianus. Major itaque Pater filio est, & planè major, cui tantum donat esse quantum ipse est, cui innascibilitas
esse imaginem sacramento nativitatis impertit, quem ex se in forma sua generat. S. Hilary. de Trinit. l. 9. Non præstantem
quemquam cuiquam genere substantiæ, sed subjectum alterum alteri nativitate nature: Patrem in eo majorem esse quod Pater
est, Filium in eo non minorem esse quod filius sit. Id. de Synod. contra Arianos. Quis Patrem non potius confitebitur ut in-
genitum à genito, ut Patrem à filio, ut cum qui miserit ab eo qui missus est, ut volentem ab ipso qui obediat? & ipse nobis testis
est, Pater major me est. Id. de Trin. l. 3. In eo quod in se sunt Dei, ex Deo Divinitatem cognosce; in eo verò quod Pater
major est, confessionem paternæ autoritatis intellige. Id. l. 11. And before all these Alexander Bishop of Alexandria; Τὸ δὲ
ἀρχόντων τὸ πατεὶ μόνον ἰδίωμα παρὶται δὲ δέχονται, αἶψα δὲ καὶ αὐτὸ φασκόντες τὸ σωτῆρος, Ὁ πατὴρ μὴ μείζων μὲν ἐστὶ. Theo-
dor. Mist. l. 1. c. 4. Lastly, we have the testimony of Photius, that many of the ancient Fathers so expounded it: Τὸ δὲ πατὴρ μὴ
μείζων μὲν ἐστὶ, τὸ ἀρχόντων ὡς πῶς, διαφέρει οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν ἐξουσίαν. οἱ υἱὲς γὰρ φασὶν τὸ αὐτῶν μείζονα ἵσαται. Epist. 176.
Æqualis Patri; sed major Pater, quod ipse dedit ipsi omnia, & causa est ipsi Filio ut sit, ut isto modo sit. Victor. Afer l. 1. Pa-
ter, inquit, major me est; merito major, quia solus hic auctor sine auctore est. Phœbadus. * John 5. 30, 19. † Quicquid filius
habet ut faciat, à Patre habet ut faciat. Quare habet à Patre ut faciat? quia à Patre habet ut filius sit; quia à Patre habet ut
possit; quia à Patre habet ut sit. S. Aug. Tract. 20. in Joan. * Non alia potentia est in Filio, & alia substantia; sed ipsa est
potentia quæ substantia; substantia ut sit, potentia ut possit. Ergo quia Filius de Patre est, ideo dixit, Non potest Filius à se facere
quicquam: quia non est filius à se, ideo non potest à se. Id. Torum quod est, de Patre est; torum quod potest, de Patre est;
quoniam quod potest & est, de Patre torum est. Id. Non potest Filius à se facere quicquam, nisi quod viderit Patrem facientem:
quia de Patre est totus Filius, & tota substantia & potentia ejus ex illo est qui genuit eum. Id. Tract. 21. Et primum Filium
cognosce, cum dicitur, Non potest Filius à se facere quicquam, nisi quod viderit Patrem facientem. Habes nativitatem Filii, quæ ab
se nihil potest facere nisi videat. In eo autem quod à se nihil potest, innascibilitas admittit errorem. Ab se enim non potest
posse nativitas. S. Hilary. de Trin. l. 7. Dum non à se facit, ad id quod agit secundum nativitatem sibi Pater auctor est. Id. l. 11.
Autorem discrevit, cum ait, Non potest à se facere: Obedientiam significat, cum addit, Nisi quod viderit Patrem facientem. Id. de Synod.

and

and being he gave him all the power, as communicating his entire and undivided Essence, therefore *what things soever he doth, these also doth the Son likewise*, by the same power by which the Father worketh, because he had received the same Godhead in which the Father subsisteth. There is nothing more intimate and essential to any thing than the Life thereof, and that in nothing so conspicuous as in the Godhead, where life and truth are so inseparable, that there can be no living God but the true, no true God but the living. ^a *The Lord is the true God, he is the living God, and an everlasting King*, saith the Prophet *Jeremy*; and *S. Paul* putteth the *Thessalonians* in mind, how they ^b *turned from idols, to serve the living and true God*. Now life is otherwise in God than in the Creatures: in him originally, in them derivatively; in him as in the fountain of absolute perfection, in them by way of dependence and participation: our life is in him, but his is in himself; and ^{*} *as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself*: † both the same life, both in themselves, both in the same degree, as the one, so the other; but onely with this difference, the Father giveth it, and the Son receiveth it. From whence he professeth of himself, that *the living Father sent him, and that he liveth* ^{*} *by the Father*.

in semetipso quam nemo ei dedit, Filius autem habet vitam in semetipso quam Pater dedit. *S. Aug. Tract. 19. in Job.* Incom- mutabilis est vita Filii sicut & Patris, & tamen de Patre est: & inseparabilis est operatio Patris & Filii; sed tamen ita operari Filio de illo est de quo ipse est, id est, de Patre. *Id. de Trin. l. 2. c. 1.* † Sicut habet, dedit; qualem habet, dedit; quantum habet, tantam dedit. *Id. contra Maxim. l. 3. c. 14.* Ergo quod dicitur *dedit filio*, tale est ac si diceretur, genuit filium; gene- rando enim dedit. Quomodo enim dedit ut esset, sic dedit ut vita esset, & sic dedit ut in semetipso vita esset. *Id. Tract. 22. in Job.* Tali confessione originis suæ indiscrētæ naturæ perfecta natiuitas est. Quod enim in utroque vita est, id in utroque significatur essentia; & vita quæ generatur ex vita, id est, essentia quæ de essentia nascitur, dum non dissimilis nascitur scilicet, quia vita ex vita est, tener in se indissimilem naturam originis suæ, quia & natæ & gignentis essentia, id est, vitæ quæ habetur & data est, similitudo non discrepet. *S. Hilary. de Synod. advers. Arianos.* Quia ergo apparet vita Patris hoc esse quod ipse est; sicut habet vitam in se, sic dedit: sic dedit Filio habere vitam, id est, sic est esse Filii, sicut esse Patris. *Vigil. Africanus Disput.* In vita naturæ & essentia significatio est, quæ sicut habetur, ita data esse docetur ad habendum. *S. Hilary. id.* * Propter Patrem vivit Filius, quod ex Patre Filius est: propter Patrem, quod cruciatum est verbum ex Patris corde, quod à Patre processit, quod ex paterno generatus est utero, quod fons Pater Filii est, quod radix Pater Filii est. *S. Ambrosius. de Fide, l. 4. c. 5.*

We must not therefore so far endeavour to involve our selves in the dark- ness of this mystery, as to deny that glory which is clearly due unto the Fa- ther; whose preeminence undeniably consisteth in this, that he is God not of any other, but of himself, and that there is no other person who is God, but is God of him. It is no diminution to the Son, to say he is from another, for his very name imports as much; but it were a diminution to the Father to speak so of him: and there must be some preeminence, where there is place for derogation. * What the Father is, he is from none; what the Son is, he is from him: what the first is, he giveth; what the second is, he receiveth. The first is a Father indeed by reason of his Son, but he is not God by reason of him; whereas the Son is not so onely in regard of the Father, but also God by reason of the same.

est, propter Filium est. Filius verò & quod filius est, propter Patrem est, & quod est, à Patre est. *S. Aug. Tract. 19. in Job.* Filium dicimus Deum de Deo, Patrem autem Deum tantum, non de Deo. Unde manifestum est quod Filius habet alium de quo sit, & cui filius est; Pater autem non filium de quo sit habeat, sed cui Pater sit. Omnis enim filius de patre est quod est, & patri filius est: nullus autem pater de filio est quod est, sed filio pater est. *Id. de Trin. l. 2. c. 1.* Filius non hoc tantum habet na- scendo, ut Filius sit, sed omnino ut sit. *Ib. l. 5. c. 14.* Filius non tantum ut sit Filius, quod relative dicitur, sed omnino ut sit, ipsam substantiam, nascendo habet. *Ibid. c. 15.* Pater non habet patrem de quo sit, Filius autem de Patre est ut sit, atque ut illi coæternus sit. *Ibid. l. 6. c. 10.* Ab ipso, inquit, sum; quia Filius de Patre, & quicquid est filius, de illo est cuius est filius. Ideo Dominum Jesum dicimus Deum de Deo, Patrem non dicimus Deum de Deo: & dicimus Dominum Jesum lumen de lu- mine, Patrem non dicimus lumen de lumine, sed tantum lumen. Ad hoc ergo pertinet quod dixit, *Ab ipso sum*. *Id. Tract. in Job. 31.* Pater non est si non habeat Filium, & Filius non est si non habeat Patrem: sed tamen Filius Deus de Patre, Pater autem Deus, sed non de Filio: Pater Filii, non Deus de Filio; ille autem Filius Patris, & Deus de Patre. *Id. Tract. 30. in Job.* Hoc tamen inter Patrem & Filium interest, quia Pater à nullo hoc accepit, Filius autem per generationem omnia Pa- tris accepit. *Ambr. in Epist. ad Eph. c. 7.* Est ergo Deus Pater omnium, institutor & creator, solus originem nesciens. *No- vat. de Trin. c. 31.* whereas he speaks after of the Son, Est ergo Deus, sed in hoc ipsum genitus, ut esset Deus. Pater est Deus de quo Filius est Deus, de quo autem Pater nullus est Deus. *S. Aug. Epist. 66.*

^a Jer. 10. 10.
^b 1 Thes. 1. 9.
^{*} Job. 5. 26.
Sicut habet
Pater vitam
in semetipso,
sic dedit &
Filio vitam
habere in se-
metipso: ut
hoc solum
inter sit in-
ter Patrem
& Filium,
quia Pater
habet vitam

* Pater de
nullo patre,
Filius de
Deo Patre:
Pater quod
est, à nullo
est; quod
autem Patet

H**b.** 3. 1.
 Joh**n** 20. 21.
 * Pater enim
 solus nuf-
 quam legi-
 tur missus.
 S. Aug. l. 2.
 de Trinit. c. 5.
 † Solus Pater
 non legitur
 missus, quia
 solus non ha-
 bet autho-
 rem à quo
 genitus sit,
 vel à quo
 procedat.
 E: ideo non
 propter natu-
 ra: diversita-
 tem, sed pro-
 pter ipsam
 authorita-
 tem, solus
 Pa: er non di-
 citur missus:
 non enim
 splendor aut
 fervor ignem,
 sed ignis
 mittit five
 splendorem
 five fervo-
 rem. S. Aug.
 Serm. contr.
 Arian. c. 4.
 Qui mittit,
 potestatem
 suam in eo
 quod mittit
 ostendit. S.
 Hilari. l. 8.

* Matth. 21. 33. &c. ^b Heb. 1. 1, 2. * Si voluisset Deus Pater per subjectam creaturam visibiliter apparere, absurdissime tamen aut à Filio, quem genuit, aut à Spiritu Sancto, qui de illo procedit, missus diceretur. S. Aug. de Trinit. l. 4. c. ult. ^c John 6. 57. † Filius est igitur à Patre missus, non Pater à Filio; quia Filius est à Patre natus, non Pater à Filio. Fulgent. l. 8. contra Fabia- num, in Collect. Theodul. de S. S. Quis autem Christianus ignorat quod Pater miserit, missusque sit Filius? Non enim genito- rem ab eo quem genuit, sed genitum à genitore mitti oportebat. S. Aug. contra Maxim. l. 3. c. 14. Ubi audis, Ipse me misit, noli intelligere naturæ dissimilitudinem, sed generantis auctoritatem. Id. Trinit. 31. in Job. ^d Εὐταύτη ἐν ὁ ὁμιλεῖται καὶ ὁ ὁμιλεῖται, ἡ δὲ θεὸς ὁ πᾶντος ἀγαθὸν μὲν ἐν τῷ πνεύματι, τῷ πνεύματι, τῷ πνεύματι, τῷ πνεύματι. Epiph. Hæres. 69. 54. Hence the language of the Schools, Missio importat processionem originis, as Thom. Aquin. 10. q. 43. ar. 1. ad primum; or auctoritatem principii, as Duvaad. l. 1. dist. 15. q. 1. ^e Job. 7. 29. * λέγει καὶ τὸ ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ κατὰς ἑρμηνεύοντες, ὅτι ὁ ὁμιλεῖται καὶ ὁ ὁμιλεῖται, καὶ ὁ ὁμιλεῖται καὶ ὁ ὁμιλεῖται, καὶ ὁ ὁμιλεῖται καὶ ὁ ὁμιλεῖται. Epiph. Hæres. 69. 53. To the same purpose Athanas. de Hum. Nat. Jusc. & Cyril. Theaur. l. 11. reade it, ὁ πνεύματι καὶ ὁ πνεύματι. and S. Basil makes Eunomius read it so, in his first Book against him, and with that addition answers it. So the second Confession of the Council of Sirmium, both in the Latine original, and Greek Translation. S. Hilari. de Syn. S. Athanas. & Secr. l. 2. c. 3. ^f Job. 14. 28. ^g Gal. 4. 4.

Upon this preeminence (as I conceive) may safely be grounded the congruity of the Divine Mission. We often read that *Christ* was sent, from whence he bears the name of an *Aposile* himself, as well as those whom he therefore named so, because as the *Father sent him*, so *sent he them*: The Holy Ghost is also said to be sent, sometimes by the Father, sometimes by the Son: But we *never read that the Father was sent at all, there being an † authority in that Name which seems inconsistent with this Mission. In the Parable, ^a *a certain householder which planted a Vineyard first sent his servants to the husbandmen, and again other servants, but last of all he sent unto them his Son*: It had been inconsistent even with the literal sense of an historical Parable, as not at all consonant to the rational customes of men, to have said, that last of all the Son sent his Father to them. So God, placing man in the Vineyard of his Church, first sent his servants the Prophets, by whom he ^b *spake at sundry times and in divers manners*; but *in the last days he sent his Son*: And it were as *incongruous and inconsistent with the Divine Generation, that the Son should send the Father into the world. ^c *As the living father hath sent me, and I live by the Father*, saith our Saviour; intimating, that by whom he lived, by him he was sent, and therefore sent by him, because he lived by him, laying his Generation as the proper ground of his Mission. Thus he which begetteth sendeth, and he which is † begotten is sent. ^d *For I am from him, and he hath sent me*, saith the Son: from whom I received my Essence by communication, from him also received I this Commission. As therefore it is more worthy to give *than* to receive, to send *than* to be sent; so in respect of the Sonship there is some priority in the Divine Paternity: from whence divers of the *Ancients read *that place of S. John* with this addition, ^e *The Father (which sent me) is greater than I*. He then is that ^f *God who sent forth his Son made of a woman, that God who hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, Abba, Father*. So that the authority of sending is in the Father: which therefore ought to be acknowledged, because upon this Mission is founded the highest testimony of his love to man; for *herein is love*, saith S. John, *not that we loved God; but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins*.

Again, the dignity of the Father will farther yet appear from the order of the persons in the blessed Trinity, of which he is undoubtedly the first. For although in some passages of the Apostolical discourses the Son may first be named, (as in that of S. Paul, *The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the holy Ghost be with you all*, the later part of which is nothing but an addition unto his constant Benediction;) and in others the Holy Ghost precede the Son, (as, *Now there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit; and there are differences of administrations, but the same Lord; and there are diversities of operations, but it is the same God which worketh all in all*;) yet where the three Persons are barely enumerated, and delivered unto us as the

2 Cor. 13. 14.

1 Cor. 12. 4, 5, 6.

natura esse quæ Deus est, quia nati cum causam nativitatis ostendat, non disproficit tamen in genere auctoris existere. *De Trin. l. 11.* Ex Spiritu enim Spiritus nascens, licet de proprietate Spiritus, per quam & ipse Spiritus est, nascatur, non tamen alia ei præterquam perfectarum atque inde-mutabilium causarum ad id quod nascitur causa est, & ex causa, licet perfecta atque inde-mutabili nascens, necesse est ex causa in causâ ipsius proprietate nascatur. *Id. l. 12.* Qui ex eo qui est natus est, intelligi non potest ex eo quod non fuit natus esse, quia ejus qui est ad id quod est causa est, non etiam id quod non est origo nascendi est. *Ibid.* Deus omnium quæ sunt causa est. Quod autem rerum omnium causa est, etiam sapientiæ lux causa est, nec unquam Deus sine sapientiâ sua. Igitur sempiternæ lux sapientiæ causa est sempiterna. *S. Aug. l. 83. quæst. 16.* And as they called the Father the cause of the Son, so they accounted it the propriety of the Father to be without a cause; as appears out of Alexander the Bishop of Alexandria's Epist. before produced.

* We have cited Phœbadius speaking so before; to which may be added, Si quis igitur adhuc & de Apostolo requirit dominicum statum, id est, singularis substantiæ dualitatem quæ per naturam

* the authour, the † root, the * fountain, and the † head of the Son, or the whole Divinity.

For by these titles it appeareth clearly, first, that they made a considerable difference between the person of the Father, of whom are all things, and the person of the Son, by whom are all things. Secondly, that the difference consisteth properly in this, That as the branch is from the root, and river from the fountain, and by their origination from them receive that being which they have; whereas the root receiveth nothing from the branch, or fountain from the river: so the Son is from the Father, receiving his subsistence by generation from him; the Father is not from the Son, as being what he is from none.

auctori suo jungitur: & paulò post; Sed cum refertur ex ipso, certè ad Patrem, ut ad rerum omnium respicitur autorem. *S. Hilary is known to speak frequently of the authority of the Father, as of the authour of his Son; and several places have been already collected, especially by Petavins, to which these may be added, besides what have been already produced.* Ipso quod Pater dicitur, ejus quem genuit autor ostenditur. *l. 4.* cum potius honor filii dignitas sit paterna, & gloriosus autor sit ex quo is, qui tali gloriâ sit dignus, exstiterit. *Ibid.* Aliud est sine autore esse semper æternum, aliud quod patri, id est, auctori, est coeternum. Ubi enim pater autor, ibi & nativitas est. At verò ubi autor æternus est, ibi & nativitas æterna est: quia sicut nativitas ab autore est, ita ab æterno autore æterna nativitas est. *Id. l. 12.* Quod verò ex æterno natum est, id si non æternum natum est, jam non erit & pater autor æternus. Si quid igitur ei qui ab æterno patre natus est ex æternitate defuerit, id ipsum auctori non est ambiguum defuisse. *Ib.* Natum non post aliquid, sed ante omnia, ut nativitas tantum testetur autorem, non præteritum aliquid in se autore significet. *Ib.* Natus autem ita, ut nihil aliud quam te sibi significet autorem. *Ib.* Ipsius tamen autor est Pater generando sine initio. *Ruff. in Symb.* Si propterea Deum Patrem Deo Filio dicis autorem, quia ille genuit, genitus est iste, quia iste de illo est, non ille de isto; fateor & concedo. *S. Aug. contra Maxim. l. 3. c. 14.* † Nec dubitaverim Filium dicere & radicis fruticem, & fontis fluvium, & Solis radium. *Tertull. adv. Praxeam c. 8.* Nec frutex tamen à radice, nec fluvius à fonte, nec radius à Sole discernitur; sicut nec à Deo sermo. *Ib.* * Εἰ μὴ γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ τέλειον ἔχον τὸ εἶναι καὶ ἀνευδένος, τίς αὖτις πηγὴ τῆς ὕλης καὶ τῆς ἀνὰ τὴν φύσιν πνεύματος. *S. Basil. Homil. 26.* Dominus Pater, quia radix est Filii. *S. Ambros. in Luc. l. 10. c. 1. ut & de Fide l. 4. c. 5.* *S. Cyril of Alexandria, speaking of the Baptismal institution, Τὴν μὲν γὰρ ἀναβάτην βίβαν, ἥς ἐπὶ κεφαλῇ τοῦ ζυμῶντος ὕδιν, ἐνοήσεις τὸν Πατέρα: τὸν δὲ γὰρ τῆς ἀναβάτης ὕλης ἐμπνευστὴ καὶ καὶ ἰσχυρὸν παρὰ τὴν ὕδιν. De S. Trin. Dial. 2.* * Ἀναρχὸς ὁ πατὴρ πηγὴ τῆς δυνάμεως ποταμὸς τῶ μορφῶς ὁ πατὴρ. *Cyrl. Hieros. Catech. 11.* In hac ergo natura filius est, & in hoc originis fonte subsistens processit ex sapiente sapientiâ, ex forti virtus, ex lumine splendor. *Vigil. Diss.* * Ὁς πνεῦμα θεοῦ, καὶ ἐξ αὐτοῦ πηγὴς, αἶνον αὐτὴν ἔχον, ὡς πηγὴ αὐτοῦ, καὶ καὶ δὲν πηγῶν. *Basil. Homil. 28.* λέγει αὐτὸ τῆς ἡ δὲ αὐτῆς γένεσις, καὶ τῆς αὐτῆς ἐξουσίας ἀνατολὴ ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας πηγῆς τῆς ζωῆς, τῆς πατρὸς διδομένης. *Aff. Concil. Nic. l. 2. c. 22.* And *S. Cyril of Alexandria, who often useth this expression, gives us the full signification of it in these words, upon the 1. of S. John: Ἀδίκως ὃ ὅλος ἐστὶν τὸ, ὡς ἐκ πηγῆς, τὸ πατεῖν τὴν ὕδιν ἵνα δέξωμεν ἐνοήσιν μόνον γὰρ τὸ εἶναι καὶ τὸ τῆς πηγῆς ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας οὐκ αἰνῶν. Patrem quidem non genitum, non creatum, sed ingentum proficemur; ipse enim à nullo originem ducit, ex quo & Filius nativitatem, & Spiritus Sanctus processionem accepit. Fons ergo ipse & origo est totius divinitatis. *Concil. Toletan. 11.* Quanto magis Dei vocem credendum est & manere in æternum, & sensu ac virtute comitari, quam de Deo Patre tanquam fluvius de fonte traduxit? *Laſtant. de falsa Sap. l. 4. c. 8.* & *inversus c. 29.* Cum igitur & Pater filium faciat, & Filius Patrem, una utrique mens, unus spiritus, una substantia est: sed ille quasi exuberans fons est, hic tanquam defluens ex eo rivus; ille tanquam Sol, hic tanquam radius à Sole porrectus. † Caput, quod est principium omnium, Filius; caput autem, quod est principium Christi, Deus. *Concil. Sirm. accepted and expounded as Orthodox by S. Hilary.* Caput enim omnium Filius, sed caput Filii Deus. *S. Hilary de Syn.* Cum ipse sit omnium caput, ipsius tamen caput est Pater. *Ruff. in Symb.* Tu capitis caput, & primi tu fontis origo. *Hilary ad Leonem.* Οὐτὶ δύο εἰσὶν ἀρχαί, ἀλλὰ κεφαλὴ τῆς ὕδιν ὁ πατὴρ, μία ἡ ἀρχή. *Cyrl. Hieros. Catech. 11.* Caput Filii Pater est, & caput Spiritus Sancti Filius, quia de ipso accepit. *S. Aug. Quæst. Vet. Test. 9.* *S. Chrysostome is so clearly of the opinion that 1 Cor. 11. is to be understood of Christ as God, that from thence he proves him to have the same Essence with God: Εἰ γὰρ κεφαλὴ γυναικὸς ὁ ἀνὴρ, ὁμοούσιος ὃ καὶ κεφαλὴ τὸ σῶμα καὶ κεφαλὴ ὃ τῆς ὕδιν ὁ θεός, ὁμοούσιος ὁ υἱὸς τῷ πατρί. So likewise Theodoret upon the same place: Ἡ γὰρ γυνὴ ἡ πόμνημα τῆς ἀνδρός, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τῆς ἀνδρός: ὡς ὁ υἱὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς πνεῦμα τῆς θεοῦ, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τῆς θεοῦ. So S. Cyril. Κεφαλὴ τῆς Χριστοῦ ὁ θεός, ὅτι ἐξ αὐτοῦ καὶ ὁ υἱὸς γενόμενος γὰρ ὁ λόγος ἐκ τῆς θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς. Ad Regim. Ep. 1.**

* Laſtant. l. 1. c. 8. *S. Hilary. l. 2. Zach. Mitylen.* † Laſtant. ib. Synes. Hymn. * S. Hieron. in c. 3. ad Eph.

Some indeed of the Ancients may seem to have made yet a farther difference between the persons of the Father and the Son, laying upon that Relation terms of greater opposition. As if, because the Son hath not his Essence from himself, the * Father had; because he was not begotten of himself, the † Father had been so; because he is not the cause of himself, * the Father were. Whereas, if we speak properly, God the Father hath * neither

* Ἀναρχος
 ὃν ὁ πατήρ,
 ἔχει ἐπε-
 ραινεῖν αὐτὸν,
 ὁ δὲ παρ' ἐκ-
 τῆς ἡμέρας.
 S. Greg. Naz.
 ὁ ἀγαθὸς
 ἔχει ἐπερ-
 ραινεῖν αὐτὸν,
 ὁ δὲ παρ' ἐπερ-
 ραινεῖν αὐτὸν.
 S. Athan. Si
 rursum quod
 ā semetipso
 sic accipias,

Howfo-

Howsoever, it is most reasonable to assert that there is but one Person who is from none; and the very generation of the Son and procession of the Holy Ghost undeniably prove, that neither of those two can be that Person. For whosoever is generated is from him which is the Genitor, and whosoever proceedeth is from him from whom he proceedeth, whatsoever the nature of the generation or procession be. It followeth therefore that this Person is the *Father*, which name speaks nothing of dependence, nor supposeth any kind of priority in another.

From hence it is observed that the name of *God*, taken * absolutely, is often in the Scriptures spoken of the Father: as when we read of *God sending his own Son*; of *the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God*; and generally whosoever *Christ* is called the Son of God, or the Word of God, the name of God is to be taken particularly for the Father, because he is no Son but of the Father. From hence he is styled *one God*, *the true God*, *the only true God*, *the † God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*.

* Ὁθεν εἰ
ἀποστολοι, καὶ
πάντα θεοὶ ἢ
ἀγία γερουσία,
ὅταν εἰπῇ, ὁ
θεός, οὕτως
ἀπολύτως καὶ
ἀνεξαρτητοῦ
ἐστι, καὶ ὡς
ἐπὶ πάντων
ἀρχῶν, καὶ
ἐν ἰσότητι τοῦ
πατρὸς ὁμοῦς.
Theod. Adv. Marc. Opusc. 42. * 2 Cor. 13. 14. * 1 Cor. 8. 6. Eph. 4. 6. * 1 Thes. 1. 9.
† Joh. 17. 3. * 2 Cor. 1. 3. Eph. 1. 3. † Unxit te Deus, Deus tuus. Id enim quod ait, tuus, ad nativitatem refertur; ceterum non
perimit naturam. Et idcirco Deus ejus est, qui ex Deo natus in Deum est. Non tamen per id quod Pater Deus est, non & Filius
Deus est. Unxit enim te Deus, Deus tuus; designat videlicet & auctor sui & ex eo geniti significatione, uno eodemque dicto
utrumque illum in naturæ ejusdem & dignitatis nuncupatione constituit. S. Hilary. l. 4. Deo enim ex quo omnia sunt Deus
nullus est qui sine initio æternus est. Filio autem Deus Pater est, ex eo enim Deus natus est. Id. paulo post. Cùm autem ex Deo
Deus est, per id Deus Pater Deo Filio & nativitatibus ejus Deus est, & naturæ Pater, quia Dei nativitas & ex Deo est, & in eo ge-
neris est natura quæ Deus est. Id. l. 11. So S. Cyrill of Jerusalem, Catech. 11. Θεός ὁ Ἰουήσους, θεός ὁ Ἰουήσους* θεός μὲν τῶν
πάντων. θεὸν δὲ αὐτῶν τὸν πατέρα, ὁμογεγενημένον.

Which, as it is most true, and so fit to be believed, is also a most necessary truth, and therefore to be acknowledged, for the avoiding * multiplication and plurality of Gods. For if there were more than one which were from none, it could not be denied but there were more Gods than one. Wherefore this † origination in the Divine Paternity hath anciently been looked upon as the assertion of the Unity: and therefore the Son and Holy Ghost have been believed to be but one God with the Father, because both from the Father, who is one, and so the * union of them.

* Μὴ μοι εἰ-
πητε, δύο θε-
οὶ κηρύσσονται,
πολυθεΐαν
καταγγέλλετε.
ὁ δύο θεός,
ὁ δὲ ὁ δύο
πατέρες. ὁ
μὲν ἀρχαῖς
ἐπιστάων δύο,
ὁ δύο κηρύττει θεός.
S. Basil. Homil. 26. In duobus ingentis diversa Divinitas invenitur, in uno autem genito ex uno ingenito
naturalis unitas demonstratur. Fulgen. Resp. contr. Arian. ad Obj. 5. Si quis innascibilem & sine initio dicat Filium, tanquam
duo sine principio, & duo innascibilia, & duo innata dicens, duos faciat Deos, Anathema sit. Concil. Sirmi. Deus utique
procedens ex Deo secundam Personam efficiens, sed non eripiens illud Patri quod unus est Deus. Si enim natus non fuisset,
innatus comparatus cum eo qui esset innatus, æquatione in utroque ostensâ, duos faceret innatos, & ideo duos faceret Deos. Si
non genitus esset, collatus cum eo qui genitus non esset, æquales inventi duos deos merito reddidissent non geniti: atque
ideo duos Deos reddidisset Christus, si sine origine esset ut Pater inventus; & ipse principium omnium ut Pater, duo faciens
principia, duos ostendisset nobis consequenter & Deos, &c. Novatian. de Trinit. c. 31. † Ὁ αὐτὸς ὁ μὴ ἀρχὴ, καὶ χτὶ τὸτο εἰς
θεός. S. Athan. Orat. 5. Θεοῦ το μὴ, ὡς ὁ ἐμὸς λόγος, εἰς μὴ θεός, ὡς ἐν ἁπλῶν καὶ ὡς ἀπὸ πνεύματος ἀνασσεύμενον.
S. Gregor. Naz. Orat. 29. Ὅπου δὲ μία μὴ ἡ ἀρχὴ, ἐν τῷ τῷ ἐξ αὐτῆς, καὶ ἐν μὴ τῷ ἀρχέτυπον, μία ὅ ἡ εἰκὼν, ὁ τῆς ἐνότητος λό-
γος ὁ διαφθεύεται. S. Basil. Homil. 26. Patri suo originem suam debens, discordiam Divinitatis de numero duorum Deorum
facere non potuit, qui ex illo qui est unus Deus originem nascendo contraxit. Novat. c. 31. Confitemur non Deos duos, sed
Deum unum, neque per id non & Deum Dei Filium, est enim Deus ex Deo, unus ex uno. Ob id unus Deus, quia ex se Deus.
Contra verò non minus per id Filius Deus, quia Pater Deus unus sit. Est enim unigenitus Filius Dei non innascibilis, ut Patri
adimar quod Deus unus sit. De Trinit. l. 4. * φύσις δὲ τοῖς τρισὶ μία θεός ἕνωσις δὲ ὁ πατήρ, ἐξ ὃ καὶ πρὸς ὃν ἀνάγεται τὰ ἐξ ἡς.
Greg. Naz. Orat. 32. Unto which words those of Theod. Adv. Marc. have relation; Θεός ὁ ἐξαίρετος λόγος, ἐπειδὴ ἡ ἕνωσις, ἥτοι
ἀναπύξις καὶ ἀνακεφαλαίωσις, τῆς τριᾶδος ὁ πατήρ ἐστίν, ὡς εἶπεν ὁ Θεολόγος. Crisost. 42.

Secondly, it is necessary thus to believe in the *Father*, because our Salvation is propounded to us by an access unto the Father. We are all gone away and fallen from God, and we must be brought to him again. There is no other notion under which we can be brought to God as to be saved, but the notion of the Father; and there is no other person can bring us to the Father, but the Son of that Father; For, as the Apostle teacheth us, *through him we have an access by one Spirit unto the Father*.

Eph. 2. 18.

Having

Having thus described the true nature and notion of the Divine Paternity, in all the several degrees and eminencies belonging to it, I may now clearly deliver, and every particular Christian understand, what it is he speaks, when he makes his Confession in these words, *I believe in God the Father* : by which I conceive him to express thus much.

As I am assured that there is an Infinite and Independent Being, which we call a *God*, and that it is impossible there should be more Infinities then one: so I assure my self that this one God is the *Father* of all things, especially of all men and Angels, so far as the mere act of creation may be styled generation; that he is farther yet, and in a more peculiar manner, the *Father* of all those whom he regenerateth by his Spirit, whom he adopteth in his Son, as heirs and co-heirs with him, whom he crowneth with the reward of an eternal inheritance in the heavens. But beyond and far above all this, beside his general offspring, and peculiar people, *to whom he hath given power to become the sons of God*; I believe him the Father, in a more eminent and transcendent manner, of one singular and proper Son, his own, his beloved, his only-begotten Son : whom he hath not only begotten of the blessed Virgin, by the coming of the Holy Ghost, and the overshadowing of his power; not only sent with special authority as the King of *Israel*; not only raised from the dead, and made heir of all things in his house; but antecedently to all this, hath begotten him by way of eternall generation in the same divinity and majesty with himself: by which Paternity, coeval to the Deity, I acknowledge him always Father, as much as always God. And in this relation, I profess that eminency and priority, that as he is the Original cause of all things as created by him, so is he the fountain of the Son begotten of him, and of the Holy Ghost proceeding from him.

I Believe in God the Father ALMIGHTY.

After the relation of God's Paternity, immediately followeth the glorious Attribute of his * *Omnipotency* : that as those in Heaven in their Devotions, so we on earth in our Confessions might acknowledge that *a Holy, holy, holy Lord God Almighty, which was, and is, and is to come*; that in our solemn meetings at the Church of God, with the joynt expression and concurring language of the Congregation, we might some way imitate that *b voice of a great multitude, as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of mighty thunders, saying, Allelujah, for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth.*

* For the oldest and shortest Creed had always this Attribute expressed in it. Inasmuch that Παροξυσμός was ordinarily by the

Ancients taken for the Father, as Origen l. 7. adv. Celsum. Ἐργεῖω ἡ αὐτὸν—ἐκείνους αὐτῶς λέγει τὰς σπουδαίας εἰς ἐν αὐτῷ Θεῷ Παντοκράτορι πηγάζοντες εἶναι ὁ λόγος, εἰς ἐν αὐτῷ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον λέγον εἶναι ὁμοτιμῶντα. And according to this general Confession did Polycarpus begin his prayer at his Martyrdom: Κύρις ὁ Θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ, ὁ τῷ ἀγαπῶντι καὶ εὐλογούντι πατρὶς σου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ πατὴρ. Eccl. Smyrn. Epist. * Revel. 4. 8. b Revel. 19. 6. Οἱ παρρησιᾶν εὐφημοῦντες τὸν παντοκράτορα πάσης κτίου. Constit. Apost. l. 1. proem.

This notion of *Almighty* in the *Creed* must certainly be interpreted according to the sense which the original word beareth in the New Testament: and that cannot be better understood then by the *Greek Writers* or Interpreters of the Old, especially when the Notion it self belongs unto the Gospel and the Law indifferently. Now the * word which we translate *Almighty*, the most ancient *Greek* Interpreters used sometimes for the title of God, *the Lord of hosts*, sometimes for his name *Shaddai*, as generally in the book of *Job*: by

* Παροξυσμός, translated by Tertul. and S. Aug. Omnipotens,

(as Tertullian translates κοσμοκράτορας mundirenentes;) by Prudentius, Omnipollens; by all, Omnipotens, (as S. Hilary translated κοσμοκράτορας mundipotentis;) and, as I conceive, it is translated Capax univerforum, by the Latin Interpreter of Hiermas. Primum omnium crede quod unus est Deus, qui omnia creavit, & consummavit, & ex nihilo fecit. Ipse capax univerforum, solus immensus est. l. 2. Mand. 1. which by the Interpreter of Irenaeus is thus translated, Omnium capax, & qui à nemine capitur. l. 4. c. 37.

^a Gen. 2. 1.

^b Isa. 45. 12.

* Κύε.Θ

οὐ αὐθ.

† Εἰ μὴ κῦ

ε.Θ σαβα

αὐθ ἐγκατέ

λιπεν ἡμῶν

αὐθ.μα.

Rom. 9. 29.

the words of

Isa. 1. 9.

Καὶ αἱ βουα

ιὲν θεοῦ τῶν

πῶν εἰς τὴν

ὄρα Κύε

αὐθ.αὐθ

εἰσὶν αὐθ.α.

αὐθ.α.

αὐθ.α.

αὐθ.α.

αὐθ.α.

αὐθ.α.

αὐθ.α.

αὐθ.α.

αὐθ.α.

αὐθ.α.

αὐθ.α.

αὐθ.α.

αὐθ.α.

αὐθ.α.

αὐθ.α.

αὐθ.α.

αὐθ.α.

αὐθ.α.

αὐθ.α.

αὐθ.α.

αὐθ.α.

αὐθ.α.

αὐθ.α.

αὐθ.α.

αὐθ.α.

αὐθ.α.

αὐθ.α.

αὐθ.α.

αὐθ.α.

αὐθ.α.

αὐθ.α.

αὐθ.α.

αὐθ.α.

αὐθ.α.

αὐθ.α.

αὐθ.α.

αὐθ.α.

αὐθ.α.

αὐθ.α.

αὐθ.α.

αὐθ.α.

αὐθ.α.

αὐθ.α.

αὐθ.α.

αὐθ.α.

αὐθ.α.

αὐθ.α.

αὐθ.α.

αὐθ.α.

αὐθ.α.

αὐθ.α.

αὐθ.α.

αὐθ.α.

αὐθ.α.

αὐθ.α.

αὐθ.α.

αὐθ.α.

αὐθ.α.

αὐθ.α.

αὐθ.α.

αὐθ.α.

αὐθ.α.

the first they seem to signify the Rule and Dominion which God hath over all; by the second, the strength, force, or power by which he is able to perform all things. ^a *The heavens and the earth were finished, saith Moses, and all the host of them:* and he which begun them, he which finished them, is the Ruler and Commander of them. Upon the right of Creation doth he justly challenge this dominion. ^b *I have made the earth, and created man upon it; I, even my hands have stretched out the heavens, and all their host have I commanded.* And on this dominion or command doth he raise the title of * the Lord of hosts; which, though preserved in the † original language both by S. Paul and S. James, yet by S. John is turned into that word which we translate Almighty. Wherefore from the use of the sacred Writers, from the * notation of the word in Greek, and from the testimony of the ancient † Fathers, we may well ascribe unto God the Father, in the explication of this Article, the dominion over all, and the rule and government of all.

αὐθ.α. Jam. 5. 4. which are the words of S. James, in relation to Dent. 24. 15. * Αἰ.Θ, αἰ.Θ, αἰ.Θ κῦε.Θ ὁ θεὸς ὁ παῖς οὐρα-
τος. Revel. 4. 8. which were before in Isaiah, * Αἰ.Θ, αἰ.Θ, αἰ.Θ κῦε.Θ σαβαὺθ. Isa. 6. 3. Τὸ πᾶν ἔρμηνον ἐρμήνυ καὶ ὁ θεὸς τῶν
σαβαὺθ φωνῆς, πᾶσα γὰρ τῶν ἐπαύων παραλαμβάνουσι τὸ ὄνομα εἰς τὸ Κῦε.Θ τῶν δυνάμεων, ὁ
Κῦε.Θ στρατῶν, ὁ Παῖς οὐρατος, (διαφόροι γὰρ αὐτὸ ἐξεδίξαντο οἱ ἑρμηνεύοντες αὐτὸ) ὅθεν ποιήσαμεν. Origen, contra Cels. l. 5.
* That παῖς οὐρατος should have the signification of government in it, according to the composition in the Greek Language, no man can
doubt, who but only considers those vulgar terms of their Politics, δημοκρατία, and αὐτοκρατία, from whence it appears that μονο-
κρατία might as well have been used as μοναρχία: and in that sense αὐτοκρατία is the proper title given by the Greeks to the Roman
Emperors, not only the later Historians, but even the Coins of Julius Caesar. Hesych. Αὐτοκρατία, αὐτοῦτος, κοσμοκρατία.
because the Roman Emperor was ruler of the known world. So the Devils or Princes of the air are termed by S. Paul κοσμοκράτες,
Eph. 6. 12. which is all one with ἀρχόντες τοῦ κόσμου, as will appear Job. 12. 31. and 14. 30. and 16. 11. As therefore Κράτ.
signifies of it self rule and authority, Hesych. Κράτ., βασιλεία, ἐξουσία, Κράτ., ἀρχή, ἐξουσία: to which sense Eustathius hath
observed Homer led the following writers by those words of his, --- Ὀν γὰρ Κράτ. αἰὲν ἀέξεν, Iliad. M. τὸ μὲν Κράτ. (Ὑλ-
λαμβόμεναι τι πῦρ ἔσεν τῷ βασιλείᾳ Κράτ. λέγοντι) whence Aeschylus calls Agamemnon and Menelaus διδόνον Κράτ.
Ἀγαμέμνον, and Sophocles after him, διδόνον Ἀγέμειον: and as Κράτ. to rule or govern, (Κράτ., κρείσσει, ἀρχαί) from whence
Κρατὺς, ἀρχαί, ἐξουσία. So also in composition, παῖς οὐρατος, the ruler of all. Παῖς οὐρατος, ὁ θεὸς πάντων Κράτ. Hesych.
Παῖς οὐρατος, παντοκράτ., Suid. † Αἰετοὶ ἐν οὐρανῷ ἐνα παντοκράτ. διότι παντοκράτ. γὰρ ὅτι ὁ πάντων Κράτ., ὁ
πάντων ἐξουσίαν, εἰ γὰρ λέγοντες τὸν μὲν ὅτι τῆς ψυχῆς διαποτίμω, τὸν δὲ τῆς σαρκὸς, ὁ δὲ τῆς ψυχῆς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων,
Κράτ. ὁ δὲ ἐξουσίαν μὴ ἔχων, πῶς παντοκράτ.; καὶ ὁ δεσπότης σαρκῶν, μὴ ἐξουσίαν ὅτι πνιχμάτων, πῶς παντοκράτ.;
S. Cyrill. Catech. 8. Theodorus apud Cl. Alex. p. 804. Ὡς γὰρ τὸ πῦρ ὑπερτάτον ἦν σοιχείαν, καὶ πάντων Κράτ., ὥστε καὶ ὁ θεὸς
παντοκράτ. καὶ παντοκράτ., ὁ ὡς αὐτὸς Κράτ., ποιῶν, πρῶτον, αὐξάν, αὐξάν, Κράτ. καὶ ψυχῆς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων.
Unus est Dominus Jesus Christus per quem Deus Pater dominatum omnium tenet; unde & sequens sermo Omnipotentem pro-
nunciat Dominum. Omnipotens autem ab eo dicitur, quod omnium tenet potentatum. Ruffin. in Symo.

* Ἐξουσία.

Luke 12. 5.

Acts 1. 7.

Jud. 25.

Revel. 5. 12.

† Αἰ.Θ, αἰ.Θ,

κῦε.Θ, δε-

σποτίμω: ἐν μὲν

τὸ κῦε.Θ καὶ

πρῶτον δὲ, ὅ

ἐν τῷ κῦε.Θ

πάντα, καὶ ὅς

πάντων δε-

σποτίμω τὸ δὲ

Κράτ. πάντα

ἔχει. αὐθ.

Phot. Ep.

162.

This authority or power properly potestative is attributed unto God in the * sacred Scriptures: from whence those † names or titles which most aptly and fully express dominion are frequently given unto him; and the rule, empire, or government of the world is acknowledged to be wholly in him, as necessarily following that natural and eternall right of dominion.

What the nature of this authoritative power is, we shall the more clearly understand, if we first divide it into three degrees or branches of it: the first whereof we may conceive, a right of making and framing any thing which he willeth, in any manner as it pleaseth him, according to the absolute freedom of his own will; the second, a right of having and possessing all things so made and framed by him, as his own, properly belonging to him, as to the Lord and master of them, by virtue of direct dominion; the third, a right of using and disposing all things so in his possession, according to his own pleasure. The first of these we mention only for the necessity of it, and the dependence of the other two upon it. God's actual dominion being no otherways necessary, then upon supposition of a precedent act of creation; because nothing, before it hath a being, can belong to any one, neither can any propriety be imagined in that which hath no entity.

But the second branch, or absolute dominion of this Almighty, is farther to be considered in the Independency and Infinity of it. First, it is independent in a double respect, in reference both to the original, and the use thereof. For God hath received no authority from any, because he hath all power originally

originally in himself, and hath produced all things by the act of his own will, without any commander, counsellor, or coadjutor. Neither doth the use or exercise of this dominion depend upon any one, so as to receive any direction or regulation, or to render any account of the administration of it; as being illimited, absolute, and supreme, and so the fountain from whence all dominion in any other is derived. Wherefore he being the ^a *God of Gods*, is also the *Lord of Lords and King of Kings*, the *only Potentate*; because he alone hath all power of himself, and whosoever else hath any, hath it from him, either by donation or permission.

The Infinity of God's Dominion, if we respect the Object, appears in the amplitude or extension; if we look upon the Manner, in the plenitude or perfection; if we consider the Time, in the eternity of duration. The amplitude of the Object is sufficiently evidenced by those appellations which the holy Writ ascribeth unto the *Almighty*, calling him the ^b *Lord of heaven*, the *Lord of the whole earth*, the *Lord of heaven and earth*; under which two are comprehended all things both in heaven and earth. This *Moses* taught the distrustful *Israelites* in the wilderness: ^c *Behold the heaven and the heaven of heavens is the Lord's thy God, the earth also with all that is therein*. With these words *David* glorifieth God: ^d *The heavens are thine, the earth also is thine; so acknowledging his dominion: as for the world and the fulness thereof, thou hast founded them*; so expressing the foundation or ground of that dominion. And yet more fully, at the dedication of the Offerings for the building of the Temple, to shew that what they gave was of his own, he saith, ^e *Thine, O Lord, is the greatness, and the power, and the glory, and the victory, and the majesty: for all that is in the heaven and in the earth is thine. Thine is the kingdom, O Lord, and thou art exalted as head above all. Both riches and honour come of thee, and thou reignest over all*. If then we look upon the Object of God's Dominion, it is of that amplitude and extension, that it includeth and comprehendeth all things; so that nothing can be imagined which is not his, belonging to him as the true owner and proprietor, and subject wholly to his will as the sole governour and disposer: in respect of which universal power we must confess him to be *Almighty*.

If we consider the manner and nature of this Power, the plenitude thereof or perfection will appear: for as in regard of the extension, he hath power over all things; so in respect of the intension, he hath all power over every thing, as being absolute and supreme. This God challenged to himself, when he catechized the Prophet *Jeremy* in a Potter's house, saying, ^f *O house of Israel, cannot I doe with you as this potter? saith the Lord. Behold, as the clay is in the potter's hand, so are ye in my hand, O house of Israel*. That is, God hath as absolute power and dominion over every person, over every nation and kingdom on the earth, as the Potter hath over the pot he maketh, or the clay he mouldeth. Thus are we wholly at the disposall of his will, and our present and future condition framed and ordered by his free, but wise and just, decrees. *Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honour, and another unto dishonour?* And can that earth-artificer have a freer power over his brother pottheard, (both being made of the same metall) then God hath over him, who, by the strange fecundity of his omnipotent power, first made the clay out of nothing, and then him out of that?

The duration of God's dominion must likewise necessarily be eternall, if any thing which is be immortal. For, being every thing is therefore his, because it received its being from him, and the continuation of the creature is as much from him as the first production; it followeth, that so long as it is continued it must be his, and consequently, being some of his creatures are im-

^a Dent. 10. 17.^b Psal. 136. 3.^c 1 Tim. 6. 15.^d Psal. 136. 3.^e 1 Tim. 6. 15.^f Jer. 18. 6.^g 1 Tim. 6. 15.^h 1 Tim. 6. 15.ⁱ 1 Tim. 6. 15.^j 1 Tim. 6. 15.^k 1 Tim. 6. 15.^l 1 Tim. 6. 15.^m 1 Tim. 6. 15.ⁿ 1 Tim. 6. 15.^o 1 Tim. 6. 15.^p 1 Tim. 6. 15.^q 1 Tim. 6. 15.^r 1 Tim. 6. 15.^s 1 Tim. 6. 15.^t 1 Tim. 6. 15.^u 1 Tim. 6. 15.^v 1 Tim. 6. 15.^w 1 Tim. 6. 15.^x 1 Tim. 6. 15.^y 1 Tim. 6. 15.^z 1 Tim. 6. 15.^{aa} 1 Tim. 6. 15.^{ab} 1 Tim. 6. 15.^{ac} 1 Tim. 6. 15.^{ad} 1 Tim. 6. 15.^{ae} 1 Tim. 6. 15.^{af} 1 Tim. 6. 15.^{ag} 1 Tim. 6. 15.^{ah} 1 Tim. 6. 15.^{ai} 1 Tim. 6. 15.^{aj} 1 Tim. 6. 15.^{ak} 1 Tim. 6. 15.^{al} 1 Tim. 6. 15.^{am} 1 Tim. 6. 15.^{an} 1 Tim. 6. 15.^{ao} 1 Tim. 6. 15.^{ap} 1 Tim. 6. 15.^{aq} 1 Tim. 6. 15.^{ar} 1 Tim. 6. 15.^{as} 1 Tim. 6. 15.^{at} 1 Tim. 6. 15.^{au} 1 Tim. 6. 15.^{av} 1 Tim. 6. 15.^{aw} 1 Tim. 6. 15.^{ax} 1 Tim. 6. 15.^{ay} 1 Tim. 6. 15.^{az} 1 Tim. 6. 15.^{ba} 1 Tim. 6. 15.^{bb} 1 Tim. 6. 15.^{bc} 1 Tim. 6. 15.^{bd} 1 Tim. 6. 15.^{be} 1 Tim. 6. 15.^{bf} 1 Tim. 6. 15.^{bg} 1 Tim. 6. 15.^{bh} 1 Tim. 6. 15.^{bi} 1 Tim. 6. 15.^{bj} 1 Tim. 6. 15.^{bk} 1 Tim. 6. 15.^{bl} 1 Tim. 6. 15.^{bm} 1 Tim. 6. 15.^{bn} 1 Tim. 6. 15.^{bo} 1 Tim. 6. 15.^{bp} 1 Tim. 6. 15.^{bq} 1 Tim. 6. 15.^{br} 1 Tim. 6. 15.^{bs} 1 Tim. 6. 15.^{bt} 1 Tim. 6. 15.^{bu} 1 Tim. 6. 15.^{bv} 1 Tim. 6. 15.^{bw} 1 Tim. 6. 15.^{bx} 1 Tim. 6. 15.^{by} 1 Tim. 6. 15.^{bz} 1 Tim. 6. 15.

^a 1 Tim. I. 17. *ὁ βασιλεὺς αἰώνων.*
^b Ps. 145. 13. *מלכותו לעולם ועד.*
 LXX, βασιλεία πάντων αἰώνων.
^c Ex. 15. 18. *לעולם ועד.*
 LXX, ἐπ' αἰῶνα καὶ ἐπ' αἰῶνα.
 S. Hier. in seculum & ultra. So Aquila, Throd. and the fifth Edit. in Psal. 21. 4. So the LXX again, Dan. 12. 7. *εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνες καὶ ἐπ' αἰῶνα.* Mich. 4. 5. *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα καὶ ὑπερβύσσου.*
^d Psal. 16. 2.

mortal, his dominion must be eternall. Wherefore S. Paul expressly calleth God *a the King eternall*, with reference to that of David, *b Thy kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and thy dominion endureth throughout all generations.* And Moses in his Song hath told us, *c the Lord shall reign for ever and ever*: which phrase *for ever and ever* in the original signifieth thus much, that there is no time to come assignable or imaginable, but after and beyond that God shall reign.

The third branch of God's authoritative or potestative power consisteth in the use of all things in his possession, by virtue of his absolute dominion. For it is the general dictate of reason, that the use, benefit and utility of any thing redoundeth unto him whose it is, and to whom as to the proprietor it belongeth. 'Tis true indeed, that God, who is all-sufficient and infinitely happy in and of himself, so that no accession ever could or can be made to his original felicity, cannot receive any real benefit and utility from the creature. *d Thou art my Lord, saith David, my goodness extendeth not to thee.* And therefore our onely and absolute Lord, because his goodness extendeth unto us, and not ours to him, because his dominion is for our benefit, not for his own: for us who want, and therefore may receive; not for himself, who cannot receive, because he wanteth nothing, whose honour standeth not in his own, but in our * receiving.

Ille nostra servitute non indiget, nos vero dominatione illius indigemus, ut operetur & custodiat nos: & ideo verus & solus est Dominus, quia non illi ad suam, sed ad nostram utilitatem salutemque servimus. Nam si nobis indigeret, eo ipso non verus dominus esset, cum per nos ejus adjuvaretur necessitas, sub qua & ipse serviret. S. Aug. de Gen. ad lit. l. 8. c. 11. Dixi Dominus, Deus meus es tu, quare? quoniam bonorum tuorum non egesset. Ille non eget nostri, nos egemus ipsius; ideo verus Dominus. Nam tu non valde verus Dominus servi tui; ambo homines, ambo egentes Deo. Si vero putas egere tui servum tuum, ut des panem, egesset & tu servi tui, ut adjuver labores tuos. Uterque vestrum altero vestrum indiget: itaque nullus vestrum vere dominus, & nullus vestrum vere servus. Audi verum Dominum, cujus verus es servus, Dixi Dominus, Deus meus es tu: quare tui dominus? quoniam bonorum tuorum non egesset. Id. ad Psal. 69. * Τὸ μὲν ποιεῖται τὸ ἀνευδὺς πλὴν οὐκ ἀπ' ἐμῆς ἀρετῆς ἀνευνοῦνται ἀγαθὸν ἑαυτοῦ καὶ οὐκ ἐμῆς ἀρετῆς. Hierocl. in Aurea Cay. And again, * Ὅτις πρὸς τὸν θεὸν ὡς ἀρετῆς ἀνέμωρον, οὐκ ἐκλεβὼν οὐδὲν οὐδὲν ἑαυτοῦ τῶν θεῶν τῶν ἐμῶν ἀρετῶν.

But though the universal Cause made all things for the benefit of some creatures framed by him, yet hath he made them ultimately for himself; and God is as universally the final as the efficient cause of his operations. The Apostle hath taught us, that not onely *a of him*, and *by him*, as the first authour, but also *b to him*, and *for him*, as the ultimate end, *are all things.* And 'tis one of the proverbial sentences of Solomon, *c The Lord hath made all things for himself, yea even the wicked for the day of evil.* For though he cannot receive any real benefit or utility from the creature, yet he can and doth in a manner receive that which hath some similitude or affinity with it. Thus God *d rejoiceth* at the effects of his wisdom, power and goodness, and taketh delight in the works of his hands. Thus doth he order and dispose of all things unto his own glory, which redoundeth from the demonstration of his Attributes.

An explicate belief of this authoritative power and absolute dominion of the *Almighty* is necessary, first for the breeding in us an awfull reverence of his Majesty, and entire subjection to his will. For to the highest excellency the greatest honour, to the * supreme authority the most exact obedience is no more then duty. If God be our absolute Lord, we his servants and vassals, then is there a right in him to require of us whatsoever we can perform, and an † obligation upon us to perform whatsoever he commandeth. Who-soever doth otherwise, while he confesseth, denieth him; while he acknowledgeth him with his tongue, he sets his hand against him. *e Why call ye me Lord, Lord, saith our Saviour, and doe not the things which I say?*

Secondly, this belief is also necessary to breed in us equanimity and patience in our sufferings, to prevent all murmuring, repining, and objecting against

^a Rom. 11. 36.

^b Heb. 2. 11.

^c 1 Cor. 8. 6.

^d Prov. 16. 4.

^e Psal. 104.

31.

^f Hom. 12. μ.

^g Ἡμῶν δ' ἐμ-

^h γάλοισι Διὶς

ⁱ περὶ δαίμονα

^j βούλῃ, ὅς

^k πᾶσι θνητοῖς

^l καὶ ἀθανάτοι-

^m σιν ἀνέδωκεν.

ⁿ † Ἐμὲ πό-

^o λης ὁδὸν καὶ

^p παρὰ τὴν ἑ-

^q νόμον καὶ τὸ

^r δικαίον τὸ τ'

^s ἀδικεῖν παντὶς

^t κεντῆς ὁ δὲ

^u κρότος οὐκ

^v ἔσται ἔνα

^w δὲ ἢ ἢ ἐμῇ.

^x Servus apud

^y Meand.

^z Luke 6. 46.

against the actions or determinations of God, as knowing that he, who is absolute Lord, cannot abuse his power; he, whose will is a law to us, cannot do any thing unwisely or unjustly. ^a *Let the potsherd strive with the potshards of the earth: shall the clay say to him that fashioneth it, What makest thou?* But let the man after God's own heart rather teach us humble and religious silence. ^b *I was dumb, saith he, and opened not my mouth, because thou didst it.* When ^b *Shimei* cast stones at him, and cursed him, let us learn to speak as he then spake; ^c *The Lord hath said unto him, Curse David: who shall then say, Wherefore hast thou done so?* ^c *2 Sam. 16. 10.*

Thirdly, the belief of God's absolute dominion is yet farther necessary to make us truly and sufficiently sensible of the benefits we receive from him, so as by a right value and estimation of them to understand how far we stand obliged to him. No man can duly prize the blessings of heaven, but he which acknowledgeth they might justly have been denied him: nor can any be sufficiently thankfull for them, except it be confessed that he ought him nothing who bestowed them.

But as the original word for *Almighty* is not put onely for the *Lord of hosts*, but often also for the *Lord Shaddai*: so we must not restrain the signification to the power authoritative, but extend it also to that power which is properly operative and executive. In the title of the *Lord of Sabaoth* we understand the rule and dominion of God, by which he hath a right of governing all: in the name *Shaddai* we apprehend an infinite force and strength, by which he is able to work and perform all things. For whether we take this word in * composition, as signifying the *All-sufficient*; whosoever is able to suppetitate all things to the sufficing all, must have an infinite power: or whether we deduce it from the † Root denoting *vastation* or *destruction*; whosoever can destroy the being of all things, and reduce them unto nothing, must have the same power which originally produced all things out of nothing, and that is infinite. Howsoever, the first notion of *Almighty* necessarily inferreth the second, and the infinity of God's dominion speaketh him infinitely * powerfull in operation. Indeed in earthly dominions, the strength of the Governour is not in himself, but in those whom he governeth: and he is a powerfull Prince whose Subjects are numerous. But the King of Kings hath in himself all power of execution, as well as right of dominion. Were all the force and strength of a Nation in the person of the King, as the authority is, obedience would not be arbitrary, nor could rebellion be successfull: whereas experience teacheth us that the most puissant Prince is compelled actually to submit, when the stronger part of his own people hath taken the boldness to put a force upon him. But we must not imagine that the Governour of the world ruleth onely over them which are willing to obey, or that any of his Creatures may dispute his commands with safety, or cast off his yoke with impunity. And if his dominion be uncontrollable, it is because his power is irresistible. For man is not more inclinable to obey God then man, but God is more powerfull to exact subjection, and to vindicate rebellion. In respect of the infinity and irresistibility of which active power we must acknowledge him *Almighty*; and so, according to the most vulgar acception, give the second explication of his † *Omnipotency*.

er; and because utter destruction requireth power equivalent to production, the omnipotent; from whence the LXX, Job 8. 3. translate it ὁ πάντα ποιῶν, And this Etymology rather than the former seemeth to be confirmed by the Prophet Isai. 13. 6. Howl ye for the day of the Lord is at hand, כִּשְׁרֵי יוֹם כִּשְׁרֵי יוֹם It shall come as a destruction from the Almighty (destroyer.) * Homer hath well joyned these two, Il. 6. ὁ πάντα ποιῶντος Κεγόινω, ὅταν κρείοντων, Εὐρυκλῆς ἰδὼν δὲ θεὸν ἐν ὀρεσίν, † Hoc nisi credamus, periclitatur ipsum nostræ fidei Confessionis initium, qua nos in Deum Patrem Omnipotentem credere confitemur. Neque enim veraciter ob aliud vocatur Omnipotens, nisi quia quicquid vult potest, nec voluntate cuiuspiam creaturæ voluntatis omnipotentis impeditur effectus. S. Aug. Enchir. c. 96.

* So Ra. Solomon will have it compounded of שׁ the pronoun, and ישרי באלהות לכל בריה because in God there is sufficiency, that is, sufficient power over every creature: from whence the LXX Ruth 1. 20, 21. Job 21. 15. and 31. 2. translate it inwards, as Sym. Job 22. 3. and Aquila with him, Ezek. 1. 24. † שרר vastavit, destruxit, perdidit; from whence שרר the destroy-

king what, and when, and how he pleased, of possessing whatsoever he maketh by direct dominion, of using and disposing as he pleaseth all things which he so possesseth. This dominion I believe most absolute in respect of its Independency, both in the Original, and the Use or exercise thereof: this I acknowledge Infinite for amplitude or extension, as being a power over all things without exception; for plenitude or perfection, as being all power over every thing without limitation; for continuance or duration, as being eternal, without end or conclusion. Thus I believe in God the Father Almighty.

Maker of heaven and earth.

Although this last part of the First Article were not expressed in the * ancient Creeds, yet the sense thereof was delivered in the † first Rules of Faith, and at last these particular words inserted both in the Greek and Latine Confessions. And indeed the work of Creation most properly followeth the Attribute of Omnipotency, as being the foundation of the first, and the demonstration of the second explication of it. As then we believe there is a God, and that God Almighty; as we acknowledge that same God to be the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and in him of us: so we also confess that the same God the Father made both heaven and earth. For the full explication of which operation, it will be sufficient, first, to declare the latitude of the Object, what is comprehended under the terms of *heaven and earth*; secondly, to express the nature of the action, the true notion of creation, by which they were made; and thirdly, to demonstrate the Person to whom this operation is ascribed.

* For we find it not mentioned by S. Augustine de Fide & Symbolo; neither hath Rufinus expounded it in the Aquileian, or noted it to be found in the Roman or Oriental Creeds. Leo, reciting the three first Articles in his Epistle to Flavianus,

maketh no mention of it. Epist. 10. Maximus Turinensis hath it not in Traditione Symboli, nor Petrus Chrysologus in his Sermons, amongst six several expositions. It is not in the Homilies of Eusebius Gallicanus, or the Exposition of Vegetius Fortunatus. Marcellus Bishop of Ancyra left it not at Rome with Julius: Nor did Arius in his Catholick Confession unto Constantine acknowledge it. Neither are the words to be found in the Latine or Greek Copy of the Creed written about the beginning of the eighth Century, and published out of the MSS. by the most Reverend and Learned Archbishop of Armagh; or in that which Eucherius and Bonitus produced against Eupandus Archbishop of Toledo, toward the end of the seventh Century. † Asia that delivered by Irenaeus, Εἰς ἓνα θεὸν πατέρα παντοκράτορα, τὸν πνευματὸν τὸν ἀειπνὸν καὶ τὸν ἄβυσσόν, καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς. Adv. Har. l. 1. c. 2. Anathat by Tertul. Unum omnino Deum esse, nec alium prae mundi conditorem, qui universa de nihilo produxerit. De praer. adv. Har. c. 13. And that under the name of Novatian, not in formal words, but with an (id est) by way of explication. Regula exigit veritatis ut primo omnium credamus in Deum Patrem & Dominum Omnipotentem, id est, rerum omnium perfectissimum conditorem, qui caelum alta sublimitate suspenderit, terram dejecta mole solidavit, maria soluto liquore diffudit, & haec omnia propriis & condignis instrumentis & ornata & plena digessit. De Trinit. c. 1. It was also observed by Origen, that the Christians were wont most frequently to mention God under that as the most common title. Ἡ δὲ ἀρετὴς ὁμιλοῦσιν τὸ κοινὸν ὄνομα, τὸ θεός, ἢ καὶ πατήρ, ὁ ἀνυμνῶνς ἡ δόξα, ὁ πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ υἱοῦ. Adv. Celsam l. 1. Eusebius delivered the first Article thus in his Confession to the Nicene Council: Πιστεύω εἰς ἓνα θεὸν πατέρα παντοκράτορα, τὸν ἡ ἀπάντων δεσπότην καὶ ἀρχόντων πνευματῶν καὶ ὡν, by S. Cyrill of Jerusalem in his Catechism, and Epiphanius in Ancorato: which addition was received, confirmed and transmitted to us by the Council of Constantinople. By which means at last we find this Article thus expressed in the Western Confession, Credo in Deum Patrem omnipotentem, creatorem caeli & terrae.

For the first, I suppose it cannot be denied as the sense of the Creed, that under the terms of *heaven and earth* are comprehended all things; because the first Rules of Faith did so express it, and the most ancient Creeds had either in stead of these words, or together with them, *the maker of all things visible and invisible*, which being terms of immediate contradiction, must consequently be of universal comprehension; nor is there any thing imaginable which is not visible, or invisible. Being then these were the words of the Nicene Creed; being the addition of *heaven and earth* in the Constantinopolitan could be no diminution to the former, which they still retained together with them, saying, *I believe in one God the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible*; it followeth, that they which in the Latine Church made use only of this last addition could not chuse but take it in the full latitude of the first expression.

And

And well may this be taken as the undoubted sense of the *Creed*, because it is the known language of the sacred Scriptures. *In six days, saith Moses, the Lord made heaven and earth:* in the same time, saith God himself, *the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is.* So that all things by those two must be understood which are contained in them: and we know no Being which is made or placed without them. When God would call a general rendezvous, and make up an universal Auditory, the Prophet cries out, *Hear, O Heavens, and give ear, O Earth.* When he would express the full splendour of his majesty, and utmost extent of his actual dominion, *Thus saith the Lord, The heaven is my throne, and the earth is my footstool.* When he would challenge unto himself those glorious attributes of Immensity and Omnipresence, *Do not I fill heaven and earth?* saith the Lord. These two then taken together signify the Universe, or that which is called the World. *S. Paul* hath given a clear exposition of these words in his explication of the *Athenian Altar*; *God that made the world and all things therein, seeing that he is Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth not in temples made with hands.* For being God is necessarily the Lord of all things which he made, (the right of his direct dominion being clearly grounded upon the first Creation) except we should conceive the Apostle to exempt some creature from the authoritative power of God, and so take some work of his hand out of the reach of his arm; we must confess that *heaven and earth* are of as large extent and ample signification as the *world and all things therein.* Where it is yet farther observable, that the Apostle hath conjoined the speech of both Testaments together. For the ancient *Hebrews* seem to have had no word in use amongst them which singly of it self did signify the world, as the *Greeks* had, in whose language *S. Paul* did speak; and therefore they used in conjunction the *heaven and earth*, as the * grand extremities within which all things are contained. Nay, if we take the expositions of the later Writers in that language, those two words will not onely as extremities comprehend between them, but in the extension of their own significations contain all things in them. For when they divide the Universe into † three worlds, the inferiour, superiour, and the middle world; the lower is wholly contained in the name of *earth*, the other two under the name of *heaven.* Nor do the *Hebrews* onely use this manner of expression, but even the *Greeks* themselves; and that not onely before, but * after † *Pythagoras* had accustomed them to one name. As therefore under the single name of * *World* or *Universe*, so also under the conjunctive expression of *heaven and earth*, are contained all things material and immaterial, visible and invisible.

* Καλῶς δὲ πάντες οὐρανὸν ἐξέδεξαντο τοῖς ἀέροις, ὕδατι τε καὶ γῆνι, τὰ μέγα συμπεισισσόμενα σιγήσεια. πῶς δὲ ἀέρας φημί; ὅτι γῆ καὶ τὸ κέντρον πάντος ἐμπεισισσόμενος καὶ ἐστὶ καὶ αὐτὸν καὶ ἀρχὴ πάντων ἡ γῆ.

πῶς δὲ τῶν οὐρανῶν πάντα περιέχον ὑπερβόη; τὸ μεταλιν δὲ ἀναδιν, ἀρχὴ καὶ ὁ οὐρανός, πῶς δὲ πάντων ἡ γῆ; καὶ ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ τῆς γῆς τὰ λοιπὰ τελεῖται περιέχεται σιγήσεια. Jo. Philop. de Mundi Creat. l. i. c. 5. Τῷ καὶ οὐρανῷ (ὡματ) τὸ πᾶν ἐστὶν πᾶν τοῦ ἀπένεμα, πῶς δὲ περιέχον τὸ κέντρον. ἐν δὲ σφαῖρα ἄλλος καὶ τὸ κέντρον ἀρχὴ, ἄλλος δὲ ὁ πᾶν περιέχον. Hierocl. in Aur. Cavn. † For the Rabbins usually divide the whole frame of things into שלש עולמות three worlds: the first, עולם התחתון the inferiour, or עולם השפל the depressed and lowest world; עולם הזה הוּא הוּא that is this world, say they, to wit, this globe of earth on which we live. This they divide into three parts; ים the sea, lakes and rivers, מדבר the desert, solitary and inhabitable places, עולם הרחוק far from the habitations of men, and עולם השמים the earth inhabited. The second is called עולם התיכון the middle or inmost world; עולם הגלגלים this is the world of the spheres, containing the aerial region, and the starry heavens. The third is עולם העליון the superiour world; הוּא עולם המלאכים this is the world of Angels, אלהים of God, נפשות of souls, עולם הרוחני the spiritual world. Now being these three comprehend all things imaginable; being the first is sufficiently expressed in ארץ the earth, and the two last in שמים the heaven; it followeth that, in the sense of the Hebrews, heaven and earth signify all things. * Eis τῶν ἀληθειῶν, eis δεῖ θεός, δεῖ θεὸν τὸ πᾶν καὶ γῆν μακρόν. † Πυθαγόρας περὶ ἀνόμεσι τῷ οὐρανῷ δὲ καὶ τοῖς ἀστέροις κόσμον, ἐν τῇ ἐν αὐτῷ τῇ γῆ. Plut. de Plac. Philosoph. l. 2. c. 1. * Si Mundum dixeris, illic erit & coelum, & quæ in eo, sol, & luna, & sidera, & astra, & terra, & fræta, & omnis census elementorum. Omnia dixeris, cum id dixeris quod ex omnibus constet. Tertul. de Virg. Veland. c. 4. Φασὶ δὲ οἱ σοφοὶ καὶ οὐρανὸν καὶ γῆν καὶ θεὸν; ἀνθρώπου τὸ κοινωνίαν ζωέμεν, καὶ αἰτίαν, καὶ κοσμοποίητον καὶ κατασκευάσαν, καὶ διακοσμήσαν, καὶ τὸ δὲ ὅλον τὸτο διὰ ταῦτα κόσμον καλεῖσθαι. Jan bl. Protrept. but the words are Plato's in Gorgia.

But

ple of the world, in which the Son of God is the High Priest, the Heaven which we see is but the Veil, and that which is above, the Holy of Holies. This Veil indeed is rich and glorious, but one day to be rent, and then to admit us into a far greater glory, even to the Mercy-seat and Cherubins. For this third Heaven is the ^a *proper habitation* of the blessed Angels, which constantly attend upon the Throne. And if those most glorious and happy spirits, those ^b *morning stars* which *sang together*, those *sons of God* which *shouted for joy* when the *foundations of the earth were laid*, if they and their habitation were made; then can we no ways doubt of the production of all other creatures, so much inferior unto them.

Forasmuch then as the Angels are termed the *sons of God*, it sufficiently denoteth that they are from him, not of themselves; all filiation inferring some kind of production : And being God hath but one proper and onely-begotten Son, whose propriety and singularity consisteth in this, that he is of the same increated essence with the Father, all other off-spring must be made, and consequently even the Angels created sons; of whom the Scripture speaking saith, *Who maketh his Angels spirits, and his ministers a flame of fire.* For although those words, as first spoken by the Psalmist, do rather express the nature of the wind and lightning : yet being the Authour of the Epistle to the *Hebrews* hath applied the same to the Angels properly so called, we cannot but conclude upon his authority, that the same God who *created the wind, and made a way for the lightning of the thunder*, hath also produced those glorious spirits; and as he furnished them with that activity there expressed, so did he frame the subject of it, their immaterial and immortal essence.

If then the Angels and their proper habitation, the far most eminent and illustrious parts of the World, were made ; if only to be made be one character of imperfection ; much more must we acknowledge all things of inferiour nature to have dependence on their universal Cause, and consequently this great Universe, or, all things, to be made, beside that one who made them.

This is the first part of our Christian Faith, against some of the ancient Philosophers, who were so wildly fond of those things they see, that they imagined * the Universe to be infinite and eternall, and, what will follow from it, to be even God himself. 'Tis true that the most ancient of the Heathen were not of this opinion, but † all the Philosophy for many Ages delivered the World to have been made.

* Mundum,
& hoc quod
nomine alio
cælum appel-
lare libuit,
cuius cir-

cumflexu reguntur cuncta, numen esse credi par est æternum, immensum, neque genitum, neque interitum unquam. *Plia. Natural. Hist. l. 2. c. 1.* † Γενόμενον μὲν ὑπὸ πάντων ἑνὰ φασιν, says Aristotle, de Caelo l. 1. c. 10. confessing it the general opinion, that the World was made. Which was so ancient a Tradition of all the first Philosophers, that from Linus, Musæus, Orpheus, Homer, Hesiod and the rest, they all mentioned the Original of the world, entitling their Books, Κοσμογονία, or Θεογονία, or the like. Εἰσὶ γὰρ πῶς οἱ φασιν ὑπὸν ἀρχόντων εἶναι τὴν περὶ γένεσιν, ἀλλὰ πάντα γίνεσθαι ὑποφύειν ὃ τὸ μὲν ἀφάρτου διακρίνει, τὰ δὲ πάλιν φερέειν· μάλα μὲν οἱ τοῦ Ἡσίοδου, εἶτα ὅτι καὶ ἄλλων οἱ παλαιῶν φυσιολόγων φασιν, says Aristotle, de Caelo l. 3. c. 1. In which words he manifestly attributes the doctrine of the Creation of the world not only to Hesiod, but to all the first natural Philosophers, in which learning beginning with Prometheus the first Professor of that Science, continued in that family amongst the Atlantides, who all successively delivered that truth. After them the Ionian Philosophy did acknowledge it, and the Italian received it by Pythagoras, whose Scholars all maintained it beside Ocellus Lucanus, the first of them that fancied the world not made; whom Plato, though he much esteemed him, yet followed not; for there is nothing more evident than that he held the world was made. Δεχόμενος δὲ οὐκ ἔγωγε πάντα γένεσιν οὐ τὸ πᾶν τοῦδε ὅτι ζωοῦσθαι ἀρχαίον μὲν. In which words he delivers not only the generation of the universe, but also the true cause thereof, which is the goodness of God. For he which asks this plain and clear question, ποῦθεν μὲν αἱ, ὑφ' ὧν ἀρχὴν ἔχον ὑπομῖναι, ἢ γένεσιν, ἢ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς πῶς ἀπεδείχθη; and answers the question briefly with a γένεσιν. He which gives this general rule upon it, τὸ δ' αὖτ' ὑποκόμει φαμέν· ὅτι αὖτις πᾶσι ἀνάγκη εἶναι ἡγεῖσθαι, and then immediately concludes, τὸν μὲν ὅν ποιεῖν τὰ πᾶντες τοῦτο πᾶσι δέει πείθεσθαι, οὐ δέοντα οἱς πάντα ἀδωμάτων λεγόντων cannot, (notwithstanding all the shifts of his Greek Expofitions,) be imagined to have conceived the world not made. And Aristotle, who best understood him, tells us clearly his Opinion ἐν τῷ Τίμαιῳ, from whence I cited the precedent words, οἷον γὰρ φησι τὸν ἑσπέρην (where by the way observe that in Plato's Timeus ἑσπέρην and χρομῖον are made synonymous) ἡγεῖσθαι μὲν, ἢ μὲν εἶδαν.

When this tradition of the Creation of the world was delivered in all places down successively by those which seriously considered the frame of all things, and the difference of the most ancient Poets and Philosophers from

Moses

petty generations, or that the World was not some other way actually produced, this Argument doth not endeavour to inferre, nor can any other prove it.

† *Αὐτοχρονον*
 ὃδ' τὸ ἐν ὅπῃ
 τὸ ἀλλότῳ ἐκ
 οὐδ' αὐτὸ ὄν-
 τῶν, ἢ εἰς τὸ
 μὴ ὄν ἀναλυ-
 θῇ αὐ. ἀρῶσα-
 τος ἀποκ. κ.
 ἀνὼλεσθαι τὸ
 πᾶν. Ocellus.

The next Foundation upon which they cast off the constant doctrine of their Predecessours, was that general Assertion, That it is * impossible for any thing to be produced out of nothing, or to be reduced unto nothing: from whence it will inevitably follow, that the matter of this World hath always been, and must always be. The clear refutation of which difficulty requires an explication of the manner how the World was made: the second part before propounded for the exposition of this Article.

Now that the true nature and manner of this Action may be so far understood as to declare the Christian Faith, and refute the errors of all opposers, it will be necessary to consider it first with reference to the Object or Effect; secondly, in relation to the Cause or Agent; thirdly, with respect unto the Time or Origination of it.

† So I conceive it best expressed by *Anselme* Archbishop of Canterbury: Dicitur aliquid esse factum de nihilo, cum intelligimus esse quidem factum, sed non esse aliquid unde sit factum. *Monologii* c. 8.

* Creatio apud nos generatio vel

nativitas dicitur, apud Græcos vero sub nomine creationis verbum factura & conditionis accipitur. S. Hieron. ad Eph. 4. *ברא* is promiscuously used with *עשה*, which is of the greatest latitude, denoting any kind of effection; and with *יצר*, which rather implies a formation out of something, from whence *יצר* a potter. For the first, we read Genes. 2. 3. that God rested from all his work, *אשר ברא אלהים לעשות*: not that on the sixth day he did the work of two days, that he might rest on the seventh, as Rabbi Solomon; not that in six days he made the roots of things, that they might afterward produce the like, as Aben Ezra; not these or any other fancies of the Rabbinists; as if *ברא* signified one work and *עשה* another; for they both express the production, as appears clearly in the following verse, These are the generations of the heavens and of the earth, *בראם* when they were created, *ביום עשות* in the day that the Lord God made the heaven and the earth. So Isa. 45. 12. I have made the earth, and created man upon it: where the first expresseth the proper, the second the improper creation. Which indifferent acceptation appeareth in collating Psal. 115. 15. and 121. 2. with Isa. 42. 5. and 45. 18. as also Isa. 17. 7. with Eccl. 12. 1. From whence the LXX translate *ברא* indifferently *ποίησεν* or *ἐποίησεν*. For the second, *יצר* is usually rendered by the Targum *ברא*, and by the LXX, though generally *ἐποίησεν*, yet sometimes *ἐποίησεν*. And that it hath the same signification will appear by conjoining Gen. 2. 7. with Isa. 45. 12. and not only so, but by that single verse Isa. 43. 1. Now thus saith the Lord *בראך* that created thee, O Jacob, *יצרך* and he that formed thee, O Israel. Lastly, all these are jointly used in the same validity of expression, Isa. 43. 7. Every one that is called by my name: for *בראתיו* I have created him for my glory, *יצרתי* I have formed him, yet *עשיתי* I have made him. * As Gen. 1. 21. b Gen. 1. 27. and 2. 7. c Psal. 51. 10. Isa. 65. 17. d Num. 16. 30. * Creatio atque conditio nunquam nisi in magnis operibus nominantur: verbi causa, mundus creatus est, urbs condita est, domus vero, quamvis magna sit, edificata potius dicitur, quam condita vel creata. In magnis enim operibus atque facturis verbum creationis affluitur. S. Hier. ad Eph. c. 4. e Isa. 43. 7.

We must not therefore weakly collect the true nature of Creation from the force of any word which by some may be thought to express so much, but we must collect it from the testimony of God the Creatour, in his word, and

and of the world created, in our reason. The opinion of the Church of the Jews will sufficiently appear in that zealous mother to her seventh and youngest son; *I beseech thee, my son, look upon the heaven and the earth, and all that is therein, and consider that God made them of things that were not*: which is a clear description of Creation, that is, production out of nothing. But because this is not by all received as Canonical, we shall therefore evince it by the undoubted testimony of S. Paul, who expressing the nature of Abraham's faith, propoundeth him whom he believed as God who quickeneth the dead, and calleth those things which be not, as though they were. For as to be called in the language of the Scripture is to be, (*Behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God*, saith S. John in his Epistle, who in his Gospel told us, *he had given us power to become the sons of God*;) so to call is to make, or cause to be. As where the Prophet Jeremy saith, *Thou hast caused all this evil to come upon them*, the original may be thought to speak no more then this, *thou hast called this evil to them*. He therefore calleth those things which be not, as if they were, who maketh those things which were not, to be, and produceth that which hath a being out of that which had not, that is, out of nothing. This reason, generally persuasive unto Faith, is more peculiarly applied by the Apostle to the belief of the Creation: for through faith, saith he, *we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear*. Not as if the earth, which we see, were made of air, or any more subtle body, which we see not; nor as if those things which are seen were in equal latitude commensurable with the worlds which were framed: but that those things which are seen, that is, which are, were made of those which * did not appear, that is, which were not.

2 Macc. 7. 28.

1 John 3. 1.

Jer. 32. 23.
וְהָיָה

Heb. 11. 3.

* For I take
μὴ ἐν φανερῷ
ἀλλ' ἐν κρυπτῷ
in this

place to be equivalent unto *וְהָיָה עִתָּהּ* in the Maccabees, and that of the same sense with *וְהָיָה עִתָּהּ*, as the Syriac Translation, *וְהָיָה עִתָּהּ* ex his quæ non conspiciuntur. *וְהָיָה עִתָּהּ* which manner of speech may be observed even in the best Greek Authors: as in Aristotle, *μεταβάλλοι ἀπὸ τοῦ μεταβάλλοντες πρὸς τὸ ἴδιον* ἢ γὰρ ἐξ ὑποκειμένου εἰς ὑποκειμένου, ἢ ἐκ ἐξ ὑποκειμένου εἰς ὑποκειμένου, ἢ μὴ ἐξ ὑποκειμένου εἰς ὑποκειμένου, ἢ ἐξ ὑποκειμένου εἰς μὴ ὑποκειμένου. *ἢ ἐκ ἐξ ὑποκειμένου* is the same with *ἐξ ὑποκειμένου*, and *μὴ ἐξ ὑποκειμένου* with *ἐκ μὴ ὑποκειμένου*.

Vain therefore was that opinion of a real matter coæval with God, as necessary for production of the world by way of subject, as the eternall and Almighty God by way of efficient. For if some real and material Being must be presupposed by indispensable necessity, without which God could not cause any thing to be, then is not he independent in his actions, nor of infinite power and absolute activity; which is contradictory to the divine perfection. Nor can any reason be alledged why he should be dependent in his operation, who is confessed independent in his being.

And as this coeternity of matter opposeth God's Independency, the proper notion of the Deity, so doth it also contradict his All-sufficiency. For if without the production of something beside himself he cannot make a demonstration of his Attributes, or cause any sensibility of his power and will for the illustration of his own glory; and if without something distinct wholly from himself he cannot produce any thing; then must he * want something external: and whosoever wanteth any thing is not all-sufficient. And certainly he must have a low opinion and poor conception of the infinite and eternall God, who thinks he is no otherwise known to be Omnipotent then by the † benefit of another. Nor were the Framers of the Creed so wise in prefixing

* Nemo enim
non eget eo
de cuius uti-
tur; nemo
non subji-
tur ei cuius
eget ut possit

uti. Sic & nemo de alieno utendo, non minor est eo de cuius utitur; & nemo qui præstat de suo uti, non in hoc superior est eo cui præstat uti. Tertul. adv. Hermog. c. 8. † Grande revera beneficium contulit, ut haberet hodie per quem Deus cognoscere-
tur & omnipotens vocaretur: nisi quod jam non omnipotens, si non & hoc potens, ex nihilo omnia proferre. Ibidem. Quo-
modo ab homine divina illa vis differet, si, ut homo, sic etiam Deus ope indigeat aliena. Indiget autem si nihil moliri potest, nisi
ab altero illi materia ministraretur. Lactant. l. 2. c. 9.

the *Almighty* before *maker of heaven and earth*, if, out of a necessity of material concurrence, the making of them left a mark of impotency rather than omnipotency.

The supposition then of an eternall Matter is so unnecessary where God works, and so derogatory to the infinity of his power, and all-sufficiency of himself, that the later * Philosophers, something acquainted with the truth which we profess, though rejecting Christianity, have reprov'd those of the School of *Plato* who deliver'd, as the doctrine of their Master, an eternall Companion, so injurious to the Father and Maker of all things.

Wherefore to give an answer to that general position, That out of nothing nothing can be produced, which † *Aristotle* pretends to be the opinion of all natural Philosophers, I must first observe, that this Universal Proposition was first fram'd out of particular considerations of the works of art and nature. For if we look upon all kinds of * artificers, we find they cannot give any specimen of their art without materials. Being then the beauty and uniformity of the world shews it to be a piece of art most exquisite, hence they concluded that the maker of it was the most exact † Artificer, and consequently had his matter from all eternity prepared for him. Again, considering the works of nature and all parts of the world subject to generation and corruption, they also * observ'd that nothing is ever generated but out of something preexistent, nor is there any mutation wrought but in a subject, and with a presuppos'd capability of alteration. From hence they presently collected, that if the whole world were ever generated, it must have been produced out of some subject, and consequently there must be a matter eternally preexisting.

* As Hierocles, Καὶ πὶ κατελίσσεται τοὶ τῆς φύσεως πλάτωνος πνεῖς ἐκ ἐξελύττω ἀπὸ τοῦ δημιουργοῦ διὰ διαστροφῆς ἐννοίας; ἢ πῶς ἐκ τῶν οὐκ ἐκδομένων αὐτοτελῶν ὑπερῶν δυνάμεων κόσμον οὐκ ἐκ δυνάμεως καὶ ἑστῆς ἐκείνης ἐκείνην ἐκείνην γίνετα; ἀλλ' αἰσθητὴς ὅτι αὐτῆς οὐκ ἐστὶν ἡ μή παρ' αὐτῆς κατασκευαίσει κατελίσσεται μὲν, ἐκείνη δὲ δημιουργοῦ δυνάμει. De Provid. c. Fato. † Πᾶν τὸ γινόμενον ἀνάγκη γίνεσθαι ἢ ἐξ ὄντων ἢ ἐκ μὴ ὄντων. τῶν δὲ τῶν μὴ ὄντων γίνεσθαι ἀδύνατον. ἀλλ' ὅτι ταῦτα δημιουργοῦνται τῆς δυνάμεως πάντες οἱ μετέφύεσθαι. Physic. l. 4. c. 1. * Ut igitur Faber cum quid edificaturus est non ipse facit materiam, sed ea utitur quæ sit parata, huiusque item cerâ: sic isti providentiæ divinæ materiam præsto esse oportuit, non quam ipse faceret, sed quam haberet paratam. Cicero de Nat. Deorum. Ἀπειροκρίτων τὸ μὴ εἶναι τὴν περὶ τὴν τὴν ἀνδραγαθίαν τὸν κόσμον. Methodius ἀπὸ τοῦ γινόμενου. † So Hierocles calls him κοσμοποιὸν καὶ ἀεὶ ὄντα γινόντα. in Adv. Carm. * Ὅτι καὶ αἱ δυνάμεις, καὶ ὅσα ἄλλα ἀπὸ τῶν ὄντων ἐκ τῶν κενῶν πρὸς γίνεσθαι, ἀποσκοπεῖν γίνονται ἐν φανερῶν ἀλλ' ὅτι καὶ τὸ ἀπὸ τῶν κενῶν, ἐξ ὧν γίνετα τὸ γινόμενον, οὗ τὰ φύτα καὶ τὰ ζῶα ἐκ ἀπείρου. Arist. Phys. l. 1. c. 7.

Now what can be more irrational, then from the weakness of some creature to inferre the same imbecillity in the Creatour, and to measure the arm of God by the finger of man? Whatsoever speaketh any kind of excellency or perfection in the Artificer may be attributed unto God: whatsoever signifieth any infirmity, or involveth any imperfection, must be excluded from the notion of him. That wisdom, prescience, and preconception, that order and beauty of operation which is required in an Artist, is most eminently contained in him, who hath *ordered all things in measure, and number, and weight*: but if the most absolute *Idea* in the Artificer's understanding be not sufficient to produce his design without hands to work, and materials to make use of, it will follow no more that God is necessarily tied unto preexisting Matter, then that he is really compounded of corporeal parts.

Again, 'tis as incongruous to judge of the production of the world by those parts thereof which we see subject to generation and corruption, and thence to conclude, that if it ever had a cause of the Being which it hath, it must have been generated in the same manner which they are; and if that cannot be, it must never have been made at all. For nothing is more certain then that this manner of generation cannot possibly have been the first production even of those things which are now generated. We see the Plants grow from a seed; that is their ordinary way of generation: but the first plant could not be so generated, because all seed in the same course of nature is from the preexisting plant. We see from spawn the fishes, and from eggs the fowls receive now the original

original of their being : but this could not at first be so, because both spawn and egge are as naturally from precedent fish and fowl. Indeed because the feed is separable from the body of the plant, and in that separation may long contain within it self a power of germination; because the spawn and egge are sejungeable from the fish and fowl, and yet still retain the prolifick power of generation; therefore some might possibly conceive that these seminal bodies might be originally scattered on the earth, out of which the first of all those creatures should arise. But in viviparous Animals, whose off-spring is generated within themselves, whose seed by separation from them loseth all its seminal or prolifick power, this is not onely improbable, but inconceivable. And therefore being the *Philosophers themselves confesse, that whereas now all animals are generated by the means of seed, and that the animals themselves must be at first before the seed proceeding from them; it followeth that there was some way of production antecedent to and differing from the common way of generation, and, consequently, what we see done in this generation can be no certain rule to understand the first production. Being then that universal Maxim, that *nothing can be made of nothing*, is merely calculated for the meridian of natural causes, raised solely out of observation of continuing creatures by successive generation, which could not have been so continued without a Being antecedent to all such succession; it is most evident, it can have no place in the production of that antecedent or first being, which we call Creation.

* These words of Aristotle are very observable, in which he disputes against Spensippus and the Pythagoreans, who thought the rudiments of things first made, out of which they grew unto perfection:

Ὅσοι ὃ ὑπελαβάνον,

ὡςπερ οἱ Πυθαγόρειοι καὶ Σπένσιππος, τὸ ἀέριον καὶ χαλκίον μὴ ἐν ἀρχῇ εἶναι, διὰ τὸ ἐκ τῶν φυτῶν καὶ τῶν ζώων τοὺς ἀρχαίους αἵματα ὡς εἶναι, τὸ δὲ χαλκὸν καὶ τὸ πλεον ἐκ τοῖς ἐκ τέτων, ἐκ ὁρῶν οἰοῦνται. τὸ δὲ σπέρμα ἐξ ἐτέρων δὲ περὶ τῶν τελείων καὶ τὸ πρῶτον ἐσπέρμα δὲν, ἀλλὰ τὸ τέλειον. οἳ περὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀν φαίνονται εἶναι τὸ σπέρμα, καὶ τὸν ἐκ τέτων χυμὸν ὡς εἶναι, ἀλλὰ ἐκ τῶν ἐξ ἐσπέρματος. By which words Aristotle hath sufficiently destroyed his own Argument, which we produced before out of the first of the Physicks, and is excellently urged in that Philosophicall piece attributed unto Justin Martyr: Εἰ περὶ τῶν δὲ τὸ σπέρμα σπέρμα, καὶ ὕστερον τὸ ἐκ σπέρματος γινώσκον, καὶ χυμὸν ἀμφοτέρων, τῇ αὐτῇ γένεσιν τὸ σπέρμα ἐκ σπέρματος γινώσκον, ὡς περὶ τὸ σπέρμα τῇ ὃ γένεσιν τὸ σπέρμα ὡς περὶ τὸ σπέρμα καὶ διωσάν. ἐκ ἀέρος αἰεὶ τὰ ζῶα καὶ τὰ φυτὰ ἐκ σπέρματος. Aristot. Doct. Euerj. Plut. Sympo. l. 2. Probl. 3. Ὅθεν εὐθείας λέγει τὸ σπέρμα εἶναι τὸν ἀνθρώπον, καὶ τὸ ὡς εἶναι τὸ αἰεὶ τὸ αἰεὶ τοῦ ἀλλοιοῦσθαι τῆς ὃ ἀλλοιοῦσθαι τὸ ὡς εἶναι, καὶ τὸ σπέρμα τὸ ἀνθρώπου λέγειν.

Now when we thus describe the nature of Creation, and under the name of *Heaven and Earth* comprehend all things contained in them, we must distinguish between things created. For some were made immediately out of nothing, by a proper, some onely mediately, as out of something formerly made out of nothing, by an improper kind of Creation. By the first were made all immaterial substances, all the orders of Angels, and the Souls of men, the Heavens and the simple or elemental bodies, as the earth, the water, and the air. ^a *In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth; so in the beginning*, as without any preexisting or antecedent matter: this earth, when so *in the beginning* made, was ^b *without form and void*, covered with waters likewise made not out of it, but with it, the same which, ^c *when the waters were gathered together unto one place, appeared as dry land*. * By the second, all the *hosts of the earth*, the fowls of the air, and the fishes of the sea. ^d *Let the earth, said God, bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed, and the fruit-tree yielding fruit after his kind*. ^e *Let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creature that hath life, and fowl that may flie above the earth; and more expressely yet, ^f Out of the ground God formed every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air*. And well may we grant these plants and animals to have their origination from such principles, when we reade, ^g *God formed man of the dust of the ground; and said unto him whom he created in his own image, ^h Dust thou art*.

^a Gen. 1. 1.

^b Verse 2.

^c Verse 9.

* Hic visibilis mundus ex materia quæ à Deo facta fuerat factus est & ornatus.

Gen. 1. 10.

^d Gen. 1. 11.

^e Verse 20.

^f Gen. 1. 19.

^g Gen. 2. 7.

^h Gen. 3. 19.

Having thus declared the notion of *Creation* in respect of those things which were created, the next consideration is of that *Action* in reference to the Agent who created all things. Him therefore we may look upon first

their action. To conceive any such necessity in the Divine operations, were to deny all knowledge in God, to reduce him into a condition inferiour to some of the works of his own hands, and to fall under the censure contained in the Psalmist's question, *He that planted the ear, shall he not hear? he that formed the eye, shall he not see? he that teacheth man knowledge, shall he not know?* Psal. 94. 9, 10

Those creatures which are endued with understanding, and consequently with a will, may not only be necessitated in their actions by a greater power, but also as necessarily be determined by the proposal of an infinite good: whereas neither of these necessities can be acknowledged in God's actions, without supposing a power beside and above Omnipotency, or a real happiness beside and above Allsufficiency. Indeed if God were a necessary Agent in the works of Creation, the Creatures would be of as necessary Being as he is; whereas the necessity of being is the undoubted prerogative of the first Cause. *He worketh all things after the counsel of his own will,* saith the Apostle: Eph. 1. 11. and wheresoever counsel is, there is election, or else 'tis vain; where a will, there must be freedom, or else 'tis weak. We cannot imagine that the all-wise God should act or produce any thing but what he determineth to produce; and all his determinations must flow from the immediate principle of his will. If then his Determinations be free, as they must be coming from that principle, then must the Actions which follow them be also free. Being then the goodness of God is absolutely perfect of it self, being he is in himself infinitely and eternally happy, and this happiness as little capable of augmentation as of diminution; he cannot be thought to look upon any thing without himself as determining his will to the desire, and necessitating to the production of it. If then we consider God's goodness, he was moved; if his Allsufficiency, he was not necessitated: if we look upon his will, he freely determined; if on his power, by that determination he created the World.

Wherefore that ancient conceit of a necessary emanation of God's goodness in the eternall creation of the World will now easily be refuted, if we make a distinction in the equivocal notion of Goodness. For if we take it as it signifieth a rectitude and excellency of all vertue and holiness, with a negation of all things morally evil, vicious, or unholy; so God is absolutely and necessarily good: but if we take it in another sense, as indeed they did which made this Argument, that is, rather for beneficence, or communicativeness of some good to others; then God is not necessarily, but freely, good, that is to say, profitable and beneficial. For he had not been in the least degree evil or unjust, if he had never made the World or any part thereof, if he had never communicated any of his perfections by framing any thing beside himself. Every proprietary therefore being accounted master of his own, and thought freely to bestow what-e're he gives; much more must that one eternall and independent Being be wholly free in the communicating his own perfections without any necessity or obligation. We must then look no farther then the determination of God's will in the creation of the World.

For this is the admirable power of God, that with him to will is to effect, to determine is to perform. So the Elders speak before him that sitteth upon the Throne; *Thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure* (that is, by thy will) *they are and were created.* Where there is no resistance in the object, where no need of preparation, application, or instrumental advantage in the Agent, there the actual determination of the Will is a sufficient production. Thus God did make the Heavens and the earth by * willing them to be. This was his first command unto the creatures, and their existence was their first obedience. † *Let there be light,* this is the injunction; *and there was light,* that's the creation. Which two are so intimately and immediately the same,

I

that

^a Rev. 4. 11.
* So Clemens
Alexandrianus
speaks of God,
Ὁ ἀπὸ τοῦ βέ-
λεος δημιουργ-
οῦς, ὃς τὸ
μυστήριον ἐκεί-
νου αὐτὸν ἐ-
κτίσται τὸ γέ-
νηναι.
Princip.
† Γενήσθω
ὁ φῶς, καὶ τὸ
φῶς ἐγένετο
καὶ γενέθη.
S. Basil.
Ὁ πᾶς ὁ
ὢν θεὸς καὶ
πνεῦμα καὶ
σοφία καὶ
λόγος, πᾶς
ἐν τῷ θεῷ
μοῦν ὁπῶς
ἡ γένεσις ἐν
ἐκείνῳ πο-
τὶ γινώσκου-
μεν.
Id. in
Hex. c. 1.
Τὸ ὅτι ὁ πα-
τήρ θεὸς ὁ
ἐκείνός ἐστι
ἐκείνῳ δημιουργ-
οῦς, ὅτι
τὴν βουλὴν
ἐκείνου τὴν κτί-
σιν; Id. l. 2.
adv. Eunom.

* As *γεννη-
ται* φως, &
ἐγένετο φως
Fiat lux, &
facta est lux.
or, as Aquila,
γενέσθω, &
ἐγένετο as
Symmachus,
ἔστω, & ἐγένε-
το. all with a
difference:
whereas in
the Hebrew
it is a most
expressive and
significant
anology,

אור
אור

† As Dionysius Longinus,
μετ' ἡμῶν,
Sect. 7. Ταύ-
την & ὁ Θεὸς
Ἰουδαίων δε-
σμοδέτης, ὃς
ὁ πύργον ἀ-
νῆ, ἐπειδὴ
τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ
δυναμὴν καὶ
τὴν ἀξίαν
ἐγείρεται
καὶ ἐγεννῶν
ἐκδύς ἐν τῇ
ἐκκολλῇ γενέ-
σθαι τοῦ
μῶν, ἔπειτα
ὁ Θεός, ἐπὶ
τῇ γενέσθαι
φωτός, & ἐγένε-
το. ἡμεῖς
γενέσθαι
τοῦ, where ob-
serve, Longi-
nus made use of the Translation of Aquila.

* Πάντα ὅσα ἠθέλησεν ἐποίησεν ἐν τῷ ὅρατι & ἐν τῇ γῇ. ὅρας ὅτι ἔχει τοῦτο δυνά-
μει καὶ ἐν τῇ γῇ μόνον, ἀλλὰ & τοῦτο καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀνὰ δυνάμει ἡρώσας ἢ θάλασσαν αὐτῇ μόνῃ. S. Chrys. i. c. περὶ τῆς ἀκαταλήπτου.
† Heb. 11. 3. * Prov. 8. 22, 23. * Job 17. 5. † As even Lucretius confesseth, and that out of the Principles of Epicurus,

Verum, ut opinor, habet novitatem summa, recensque
Natura est mundi, neque pridem exordia cepit.

'Tis true indeed, some ancient accounts there are which would persuade us to imagine a strange antiquity of the World, far beyond the Annals of Moses, and account of the same Spirit which made it. The * Egyptian Priests pretended an exact Chronology for some myriads of years, and the Chaldeans or † Assyrians far out-reckon them, in which they delivered not onely a Catalogue of their Kings, but also a Table of the * Eclipses of the Sun and Moon.

* Plato tells us of an account which an Egyptian Priest gave to Solon, in which the Athenians

were 9000 years old, and those of Sais 8000. Πεπότερον μὲν τὴν παρ' ὑμῶν ἔπειτα χιλίους ἐν γῆσι τε καὶ ἡραῖς τὸ σπέρμα ἀνθρώπων ὑμῶν. τὴν δ' ὑστερον τῆς ἐκείνου διακοσμήσεως παρ' ἡμῶν ἐν τοῖς ἑσπερίοις γεγραμμένην ὀκτακισμύλιαν ἐστὶν ἀειμῶς γέγραπται. In Timeo. Pomponius Mela makes a larger account out of Herodotus: Ipsi vetustissimi (ut prædicant) hominum trecentos & triginta reges ante Amasim, & supra tredecim millium annorum ætates certis Annalibus; where, as the Egyptians much stretch the truth, so doth Mela stretch the relation of Herodotus, who makes it not 13000, but 11340 years. Diodorus Siculus tells us of 23000 years from the reign of the first King of Egypt to the Expedition of Alexander; and Diogenes Laertius out of other Authors more than doubles that account. Αἰγυπτῖοι μὲν γὰρ Νεῖλον γενέσθαι πᾶν. Ἡρώσας, ἐν ἁρξαι φιλοσοφίας, ἡς τὸν σπερματικὴν ἐξέσθαι τὴν ἀνθρώπων. καὶ ὁκτακισμύλια ὀκτακισμύλια ἐπὶ ἐξήκοντα τέλει. 48863. † Ἀσσυρίοι δ' ἐπὶ τὴν ἰαμύλιον, ὃς ἐπὶ αὐτῇ ἐκκοσμοῦ ἐστὶν μόνος ἐπὶ τῇ σφαιρῇ, ὡς ἐπὶ τῇ ἰαμύλιον. ἀνὰ δ' ὅλας ἀποκαταστάσεις καὶ ἀνθρώπων ἐπὶ τῇ ἀποκαταστάσει μνήμη παρέδωκεν. Proclus in Timeum. * Ἐν οἷς ἡλίου μὲν ὀκτακισμύλια γενέσθαι τετακισμύλια ὀκτακισμύλια τέλει, σελήνης δ' ὀκτακισμύλια τετακισμύλια τέλει. Diog. Laert.

But

But for their number of years nothing is more certain then their forgery ; for the *Egyptians* did preserve the antiquities of other Nations as well as their own, and by the evident fallacy in others have betrayed their own vanity. When *Alexander* entred *Egypt* with his victorious army, the Priests could shew him out of their sacred Histories an account of the *Persian* Empire, which he gained by conquest, and the *Macedonian*, which he received by birth, of each for * 8000 years : whereas nothing can be more certain out of the best Historical account, then that the *Persian* Empire, whether begun in *Cyrus* or in *Medus*, was not then 300 years old, and the *Macedonian*, begun in *Coranus*, not 500. They then which made so large additions to advance the antiquity of other Nations, and were so bold as to present them to those which so easily might refute them, (had they not delighted to be deceived to their own advantage, and took much pleasure in an honourable cheat) may without any breach of charity be suspected to have extended the Account much higher for the honour of their own Countrey. Beside, their Catalogues must needs be ridiculously incredible, when the *Egyptians* make their first Kings reigns above † 1200 years a piece, and the *Assyrians* theirs above 40000 : except ye take the *Egyptian* years for * moneths, the *Assyrians* for days; and then the Account will not seem so formidable.

* This fallacy approveth by an Epistle which Alexander wrote to his mother Olympias, mentioned by Athénagoras, Minutius Felix, S. Cyprian, and S. Augustine. Perfarum autem & Macedonum imperium usque ad ipsum Alexandrum,

cui loquebatur, plus quam octo millium annorum ille constituit; eum apud Græcos Macedonum usque ad mortem Alexandri quadringenti octoginta quinque reperiuntur anni, Perfarum vero, donec ipsius Alexandri victoria finirentur, ducenti & triginta tres computentur. S. Aug. de Civ. Dei, l. 12. c. 10. † As Diodorus Siculus takes notice of the *Egyptians*, and *Abydenus* of the *Chaldeans*, whose ten first Kings reigned 120 Sars. Ως τὸ πάντας ἐπὶ βασιλεῖς ἔκαστος ὧν ὁ χρόνος τῆς βασιλείας συνῆλθε πάρος ἐκείνων ἔκοιτο. Now this word *σαρ* was proper to the *Babylonian* or *Chaldean* account. Hesych. Σαρ, ἀριθμὸς πρὸς βαβυλωνίους, but what this number was he tells us not. In the Fragment of *Abydenus* preserved by Eusebius, Σαρ δὲ ὅτιν ἐξακόσια καὶ τεσσαρὰ ἔτη, every Σαρ is 3600 years, and consequently the 120 *σαρ* belonging to the reign of the ten Kings 432000 years. Neither was this the account only of *Abydenus*, but also of *Berosus*; neither was the interpretation only of Eusebius, but also of *Alexander Polyhistor*, who likewise expresseth τὸν χρόνον τῆς βασιλείας αὐτῶν σάρus ἐκατὸν ἔκοιτο, ἥτις ἐστὶ μυριάδας πωρυγέγοντα ἑπὶ καὶ δύο χιλιάδας. This seemed so highly incredible, that two ancient Monks, *Anianus* and *Panodorus*, interpreted those *Chaldean* years to be but days, so that every *σαρ* should consist of 3600 days, that is, 9 years, 10 months and a half, and the whole 120 *σαρ* for the 10 Kings 1183 years, 6 months, and odd days. This is all which *Jos. Scaliger* or *Jacobus Goar* of late could find concerning this *Chaldean* Computation: and the first of these complains that none but *Hesychius* makes mention of this account. I shall therefore supply them not only with another Author, but also with a diverse and distinct interpretation. Σαρεῖ μέτερον καὶ ἀεθμὸς πρὸς Χαλδαίους· οἱ δὲ πρὸ σαρεῖ ποτίζον ἐνιαυτὸν βουκ', οἱ γίνονται ἐνιαυτοὶ καὶ μῆνες ἕξ, that is, according to the Translation of *Portus*, Sars apud Chaldeos est mensura & numerus: nam 120 Sars faciunt annos 2222, qui sunt anni 18 & sex menses. Well might he fix his N. L. or, non liquet, to these words: for as they are in the printed books there is no sense to be made of them; but by the help of the MS. in the Vatican Library we shall both supply the defect in *Suidas*, and find a third valuation of the *σαρεῖ*. Thus then that MS. represents the words: Οἱ δὲ πρὸ σαρεῖ ποτίζον ἐνιαυτὸν βουκ' καὶ τὴν Χαλδαίων ψήφον, ὅσα δὲ σαρεῖ ποτίζει μῆνας σελωιακῶν σκ', οἷοι γὰρ νοτῶν ἐνιαυτοὶ καὶ μῆνες ἕξ. And so the sense is clear. Σαρ, according to the *Chaldean* account, comprehends 222 months, which come to 18 years and six months; therefore 120 *σαρεῖ* make 2220 years; and therefore for βουκ', I read, leaving out the last β, βουκ', that is, 2220. * Εἰ καὶ ὁ ὄρησις Εὐδξθ ἀληθὲς, ὅτι Αἰγυπτίους τὸν μῆνα ἐνιαυτὸν ὀκταλὺν, ἐκ αὐτοῦ ἢ ἑπτὰ πολλῶν τῶν ἐνιαυτῶν ἀπαριθμησὶς ἔχει τὴν δαμνασίν. *Proclus* in *Timæum* 31. 50.

Again, for the calculation of Eclipses, as it may be made for many thousand years to come, and be exactly true, and yet the world may end to morrow; because the calculation must be made with this tacite condition, If the bodies of the Earth and Sun and Moon do continue in their substance and constant motion so long: so may it also be made for many millions of years past, and all be true, if the world have been so old; which the calculating doth not prove, but suppose. He then which should in the *Egyptian* Temples see the description of so many Eclipses of the Sun and Moon, could not be assured that they were all taken from real observation, when they might as well described out of proleptical supposition.

Beside, the motions of the Sun, which they mention together and with authority equal to that of their other observations, are so incredible and palpably fabulous, that they take off all credit and esteem from the rest of their narrations. For with this wild account of years, and seemingly-accurate observations of the Heavens, they left it written to posterity, that the whole course of the celestial motions were four times changed: so that

* Ἐν τῷ νῦν
τότῳ τῷ
ῥέοντι πε-
ρακίς ἡλε-
ρον ἐξ ἡθίων
πῦρ ἡλίου
ἀνατείλει·
ἐν δὲ τε νῦν
καταδύεται,
ἐκδύτην δὲ
ἐπαυτίλει·
ἢ ἔνθεν νῦν
ἀντέλλει, ἐρ-
θαῖτα δὲ
καταβύβω.
Herod. Eu-
terp. Manda-
tumque lite-
ris servat,
dum Ægyptii
sunt, quater
cursus suos
vertisse fide-
ra, ac Solem
bis jam occi-
disse ubi
nunc oritur.
Mela l. 1. c. 9.
Whereas Ari-
stotle more so-
berly, * Ἐν
ἡπύῃ γὰρ
παρὰ ἡλίου
πῦρ ῥέον· καὶ
τὴν παρα-
διδόμην ἀλ-

* the Sun hath twice risen in the East and set in the West, as now it does; and, on the contrary, twice risen in the West and set in the East. And thus these prodigious Antiquaries † confute themselves.

What then are these feigned observations and fabulous descriptions for the World's antiquity, in respect not onely of the infallible Annals of the Spirit of God, but even of the constant testimonies of more sober men, and the real apperances and face of things, which speak them of a far shorter date?

If we look into the Historians which give account of ancient times, nay, if we peruse the fictions of the Poets, we shall find the first to have no footsteps, the last to feign no actions, of so great antiquity. * If the race of men had been eternall, or as old as the *Egyptians* and the *Chaldees* fantasie it; how should it come to pass that the Poetical inventions should find no actions worthy their Heroick Verse before the *Trojan* or the *Theban* War, or that great adventure of the *Argonauts* ? For whatsoever all the Muses, the daughters of Memory, could rehearse before those times, is nothing but the Creation of the World, and the nativity of their Gods.

If we † consider the necessities of life, the ways of freedome and commerce amongst men, and the inventions of all Arts and Sciences, the letters which we use, and languages which we speak; they have all known originals, and may be traced to their first Authours. The first beginnings were then so known and acknowledged by all, that the inventers and authours of them were reckoned amongst their Gods, and worshipped by those to whom they had been so highly beneficial: which honour and adoration they could not have obtained, but from such as were really sensible of their former want, and had experience of a present advantage by their means.

ἀλλοις μὴ μὲν ὕδιν φαίνεται μεταβέβηκεν, ὥστε καὶ ὅλον τὸν ἔρατον ὕδαριν, ὅτε καὶ μέσσω αὐτῷ τῷ οἰκίῳ ὕδιν. De Cælo, l. 1. V. Simpl. † As the Chaldees did affirm that they had taken Observations of the celestial motions for 470000 years; and withall they also affirmed that for the same space of time they had calculated the Nativity of all the children which were born. Which last is certainly false. Nam quod ajunt quadringenta & septuaginta millia annorum in periclitandis experiundisque pueris quicunque nati essent Babylonios posuisse: fallunt, Si enim esset factum, non esset desitum. Neminem autem habemus auctorem qui aut fieri dicat, aut factum sciat. Cicero, l. 2. de Divinat. And if the last be false, we have no reason to believe the first is true; but rather to deny their *Astronomical* Observations by their vain ambition in *Astrological* predictions. And indeed those Observations of the Chaldees being curiously searched into by Callisthenes, appointed by Aristotle for that purpose, were found really to go no farther then 1903 years before Alexander, as Porphyrius hath declared, who was no friend to the account of Moses. Διὰ τὸ μὴ πῶς τὰς κατὰ Καλλισθένην ἐν Βαβυλῶνος περιφροῦς παρατηρήσεις ἀρξικῶς οἷς τῷ Ἑλλάδα, τῷ Ἀλεξάνδρῳ τῷ τοῦ Ὀπισθόλαττος αὐτῶν ἀστρονομικῶς ὁ Πορφύριος ἔλεγε· ὅτι καὶ ἀνατολῶν τε καὶ μέγιστον καὶ ἄλλων τῶν Μακεδόνων συζωόντων. Simpl. ad 2. Aristot. de Cælo, p. 123. * This Argument is therefore to me the stronger, because made by him who cannot be thought a favourer of our Religion, because he was a countenance of none, Epicurus, whose mind is thus delivered by Lucretius, l. 5.

Præterea, si nulla fuit generatis origo
Terrarum & Cæli, semperque æterna fuere;
Cur supra bellum Thebanum & funera Trojæ
Non alias alii quoque res cecinere Poetæ?
Quo tot facta virum toties cecidere? neque usquam
Æternis famæ monumentis insita florent?

† Pliny gives a large account of these, l. 7. c. 56. and Lucretius makes use of this argument, l. 5.

Quare etiam quædam nunc artes expoliuntur,
Nunc etiam augescunt, nunc addita navigiis sunt
Multæ, modo organici melicos peperere sonores:
Denique natura hæc rerum ratioque reperta est
Nuper, & hanc primus comprimis ipse repertus
Nunc ego sum in patrias qui possim vertere voces.

If we search into the Nations themselves, we shall see none without some original: and were those * Authours extant which have written of the first plantations and migrations of people, the foundations and inhabiting of Cities and Countreys, their first rudiments would appear as evident as their latter growth and present condition. We know what ways within 2000 years people have made through vast and thick Woods for their habitations, now

* I mean, not onely such as wrote the building of particular Cities, as Apollonius Rhodius

Καδμῶ κ' Ἴλιον, Xenophanes Κολοφῶν κ' Ἴλιον, Criso Συρακοσίων κ' Ἴλιον, and Philochorus Σαλαμῖν κ' Ἴλιον* but those more general, as Aristotle Κτίσις καὶ πολιτείας, Polemo Κτίσις πόλεων καὶ Φακίδ, Chayou Πόλεων κ' Ἰλίου, Callimachus Κτίσις νήσων καὶ πόλεων, Hellanicus Κτίσις ὑπὸν καὶ πόλεων, and the Indefinite Κτίσις written by Dercyllus, Diocysius, Hippys, Clistophon, Trismachus, and others.

as fertile, as populous as any. The *Hercynian* trees, in the time of the *Cæsars*, occupying so great a space, as to take up a journey of * 60 days, were thought even then † cœval with the World. We read without any shew of contradiction, how this Western part of the world hath been peopled from the East; and all the pretence of the *Babylonian* antiquity is nothing else, but that we all came from thence. Those eight persons saved in the Ark, descending from the *Gordiean* Mountains, and multiplying to a large collection in the Plain of *Sinaar*, made their first division at that place: and that dispersion, or rather disseminations, hath peopled all other parts of the world, either never before inhabited, or dispeopled by the Flood.

These Arguments have always seemed so clear and undeniable, that they have put not onely those who make the world eternall, but them also who confess it made, (but far more ancient then we believe it) to a strange answer, to themselves uncertain, to us irrational.

For to this they replied, * That this World hath suffered many alterations, by the utter destructions of Nations and depopulations of Countreys, by which all monuments of antiquity were defaced, all Arts and Sciences utterly lost, all fair and stately fabricks ruined, and so mankind reduced to paucity, and the world often again returned into its infancy. This they conceived to have been done oftentimes in several Ages, sometimes by a deluge of Water, sometimes by a torrent of Fire; and lest any of the elements might be thought not to conspire to the destruction of mankind, the Air must sweep away whole Empires at once with infectious plagues, and earthquakes swallow up all ancient Cities, and bury even the very ruines of them. By which answer of theirs they plainly afford two great advantages to the Christian Faith. First, because they manifestly shew that they had an universal tradition of *Noah's* Flood, and the overthrow of the old World: Secondly, because it was evident to them that there was no way to salve the eternity or antiquity of the World, or to answer this argument drawn from History and the appearances of things themselves, but by supposing innumerable deluges and deflagrations. Which being merely feigned in themselves, not proved, (and that † first by them which say they are not subject themselves unto them, as the *Egyptians* did, who by the * advantage of their peculiar situation feared neither perishing by fire nor water) serve onely for a confirmation of *Noah's* Flood so many Ages past, and the surer expectation of *S. Peter's* fire, we know not how soon to come.

* Sylvanus, Hercynia dierum sexaginta iter occupans, ut major alius, ita & notior. *Mela* l. 3. c. 3. † Hercynia sylva roborem vastitas intacta avis & congenerita mundo, prope immortalis forte miracula excedit. *Plin.* l. 16. c. 2.

* Thus Ocellus, who maintained the world was never made, answers the Argument brought from the Greek Histories which began with *Inachus*, as the first subject, not author of History, (as *Nicagoras* in his Annotations mistakes Ocellus) *Διὸς καὶ τοῦ λέγοντος τῷ τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἀρχῆς Ἰνὰ καὶ τῆς Ἀφροδίτης, ἀφ' ὧν οἱ ἀρχαῖοι πρῶτος, ἀλλὰ τῆς γενουμένης*

μεταβολῆς καὶ αὐτῶν. So that he will have *Inachus* to be the first not absolutely, but since the last great alteration made in Greece: and then he concludes that Greece hath often been, and will often be, barbarous, and lose the memory of all their actions, *Πολλὰ δὲ καὶ γέγονε καὶ ἔσται βαρβαρὰ ἢ Ἑλλὰς, ἧς ἀνδράπων μόνον νομοῦν μετέσται, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὑπ' αὐτῆς τῆς φύσεως ἡμετέρων ἐδε μένον αὐτῆς γενουμένης. ἀλλὰ καὶ νεώτερος αὐτῆς καὶ παλαιότερος ἡμῶν ἀρχαῖος λαμβανόμενος.* Ocellus de universe, c. 3. Thus Plato, who asserted the creation of the world, but either from eternity, or such antiquity as does not much differ from it, brings in *Solon* enquiring the age of the Greek Histories, as of *Phoroneus* and *Niobe*, *Deucalion* and *Pyrtha*; and an *Egyptian* Priest answering, that all the Greeks were boys, and not an old man amongst them, that is, they had no ancient monuments, or history of any antiquity, but rested contented with the knowledge of the time since the last great mutation of their own Countrey. *Πολλὰ γὰρ καὶ πολλὰ θόβοι γενόμεναι ἀνδράπων καὶ ἔσονται, πρὶν αὐτῶν ἡμετέρας μέναι, μνησθῆναι δ' ἄλλοις ἔτι καὶ βραχύτεραι.* in *Timæo*. O 2. of *Celsus*, *Τὸ πολλὰς ἐκ παντὸς αἰῶνος πυρρᾶσαι γενόμεναι, πολλὰς δ' ὀπικλύουσιν, καὶ νεώτερον εἶναι τὴν ἐπὶ Διὸς καὶ Ἑλλὰς καὶ ἀνθρώπων γενεάν.* *οὐκ αὖτε τῶν αἰώνων ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων πλεονέχον τὸ καὶ αὐτὸν τὸ κόσμον ἀγένητον.* l. 1. And *Lucretius* the Epicurean, who thought the world but few thousand years old, as we believe, and that it should at last be consumed, as we also are persuaded, thinks this answer of theirs so far from being a refutation of the former, that he admits it as a confirmation of the later part of his opinion. *De rerum natura*, l. 5.

Quod si forte fuisse antehac eadem omnia credis,
Sed periisse hominum torrenti secla vapore,
Aut cecidisse urbis magno vexamine mundi;
Aut ex imbris assiduis exisse rapaces
Per terras amnes arque oppida cooperuisse:
Tanto quippe magis victus fatcare necesse est,
Exitum quoque terrarum coelique futurum.

† *Ἐξουθεν ἡ τῆς Κόσμου τῆς περὶ τῆς ἐκ πυρρᾶσαι καὶ ἐξ ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων μὴ διδόνται οἱ καὶ αὐτὸν Κοσμὸν αἰώνιον.* *Orig. adv. Celsum*, l. 1. * So that *Egyptian* Priest in *Plato's* *Timæus* tells *Solon*, that the Fable of *Phaethon* did signify a real conflagration of the world; but so as all they which lived in mountains or dry parts of the earth were scorched and consumed, but of those which

lived near the fens or rivers in the valleys, none were preserved: $\eta\mu\acute{\iota}\nu\ \delta\epsilon\ \lambda\acute{\alpha}\lambda\epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon\ \delta\ \nu\epsilon\lambda\alpha\theta\ \epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma\ \tau\epsilon\ \tau\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\alpha\ \sigma\omega\tau\eta\varsigma\ \chi\epsilon\ \pi\acute{\iota}\tau\epsilon\ \epsilon\alpha\ \tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\varsigma\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \sigma\alpha\phi\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \sigma\tau\epsilon\gamma\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ \lambda\upsilon\phi\epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon$. Thus the Egyptians perished (saved them from the flames of Pharaoh. Nor were they one) safe from Conflagrations, but from Inundations alone. For when in Greece or other parts a Deluge happened, then all their Cities were swept away into the Sea: $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\ \tau\epsilon\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\epsilon\ \tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ \rho\acute{o\gamma\epsilon\varsigma\ \lambda\acute{\alpha}\lambda\epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon\ \eta\tau\epsilon\ \pi\acute{\iota}\tau\epsilon\ \eta\tau\epsilon\ \alpha\lambda\lambda\omicron\tau\epsilon\ \alpha\pi\omega\tau\epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon\ \epsilon\pi\acute{\iota}\ \tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ \alpha\pi\epsilon\rho\alpha\varsigma\ \upsilon\delta\omega\tau\epsilon\varsigma\ \epsilon\mu\phi\acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\iota\ \tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ \epsilon\upsilon\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \chi\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\delta\epsilon\ \nu\ \epsilon\pi\alpha\gamma\acute{\alpha}\gamma\epsilon\iota\ \pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\kappa\upsilon\lambda\alpha\ \delta\delta\omega\iota\ \chi\epsilon\ \delta\acute{\iota}\ \epsilon\varsigma\ \alpha\iota\tau\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma\ \tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\delta\epsilon\ \zeta\alpha\zeta\epsilon\iota\sigma\theta\epsilon\iota\alpha\ \lambda\acute{\alpha}\gamma\epsilon\tau\alpha\ \mu\alpha\lambda\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$. So Egypt receiving not their waters from above by clouds, but from below by springs filling the river Nile, was out of danger in a Deluge, and thereby preserved the most ancient monuments and records. But, alas, this is a poor shift to them which believe that in the great and universal Flood all the fountains of the great deep were broken up, and the windows of heaven were opened, Gen. 7. 11.

It remaineth then that we stedfastly believe, not onely that the *heavens and earth and all the host of them* were made, and so acknowledge a Creation, or an actual and immediate dependence of all things on God; but also that all things were created by the hand of God, in the same manner, and at the same time, which are delivered unto us in the Books of *Moses* by the Spirit of God, and so acknowledge a novity, or no long existence of the Creature.

Neither will the novelty of the World appear more plainly unto our conceptions, then if we look upon our own successions. The vulgar accounts, which exhibite about 5600 years, though sufficiently refuting an eternity, and allaying all conceits of any great antiquity, are not yet so properly and nearly operative on the thoughts of men, as a reflexion upon our own generations. The first of men was but six days younger then the being, not so many then the appearance, of the earth: and if any particular person would consider how many degrees in a direct line he probably is removed from that single person *Adam*, who bare together the name of man and of the earth from whence he came, he could not chuse but think himself so near the original fountain of mankind, as not to conceive any great antiquity of the World.

For though the ancient Heathens did imagine *innumerable ages and generations of men past, though † *Origen* did fondly seem to collect so much by some misinterpretations of the Scriptures; yet if we take a sober view, and make but rational collections from the Chronology of the Sacred Writ, we shall find no man's pedigree very exorbitant, or in his line of generation descent of many score.

So Cicero
indeed speaks,
innumera-
bilis secula, in
his Book of
Divination:
and Socrates
in Plato's
Theætetus

brings this argument against the pride of great and noble Families, that they which mention a succession of their Ancestors which have been rich and powerful, do it merely ὅτι ἄριστοὶ δούλους, ὃ ἰσχυροὺς εἰς τὸ πᾶν αἰεὶ βλάπτον, ὡς ἐκείνους, ὅτι πάντων ἡ ἀρετὴν ἀναιδέως ἐκείνους ἡγοῦσαν ἀναθεύματα, ἐν αἷμα πᾶσαι ἡ πλῆρη, ἡ βασιλεῖς ἡ δούλοι, βάρβαροι τε καὶ ἡ ἔθνη. Εὐλόγους πελάγας μυριοὺς ἡγοῦσαν ὅπως as if every person were equally honourable, having innumerable ancestors, rich and poor, servants and kings, learned and barbarous. † Origen did not only collect the eternity of the world from the coexistence of all God's Attributes, as because he is παντοκράτωρ and ἡμωπῶς, therefore he was always so, (for how could he be ἡμωπῶς; ἀνὰ ἡμωπρωμάτων, or παντοκράτωρ ἀνὰ τῆς περατέρας;) but also from the 90 Psalm, From everlasting to everlasting thou art God. For a thousand years in thy sight are but as yesterday; and that at the beginning of Ecclesiasticus, Who can number the sand of the sea, and the drops of the rain, and the days of eternity? But Methodius, Bishop and Martyr, hath well concluded that disputation: Ταῦτά ἐστιν ὃ ἀεικίς ἀσάλευτον, ἡ ὅσα οἷα παύει.

When the age of man was long, in the infancy of the World, we find ten generations extend to 1656 years, according to the shortest, which is thought, because the *Hebrew*, therefore the best account, according to the longest, which, because the *Septuagints*, is not to be contemned, 2262, or rather 2256. From the Flood, brought at that time upon the earth for the sins of men which polluted it, unto the birth of *Abraham*, the Father of the faithfull, not above ten generations, if so many, took up 292 years, according to the least, 1132, according to the largest account. Since which time the ages of men have been very much alike proportionably long; and it is agreed by all that there have not passed since the birth of *Abraham* 3700 years. Now by the experience of our Families which for their honour and greatness have been preserved, by the genealogies delivered in the sacred Scriptures, and thought necessary to be presented to us by the blessed Evangelists, by the observation and concurrent judgement of former Ages, three
* genera-

* generations usually take up a hundred years. If then it be not yet 3700 years since the birth of *Abraham*, as certainly it is not; if all men which are or have been since have descended from *Noah*, as undoubtedly they have; if *Abraham* were but the tenth from *Noah*, as *Noah* from *Adam*, which *Moses* hath assured us: then is it not probable that any person now alive is above 130 generations removed from *Adam*. And indeed thus admitting but the *Greek* account of less than 5000 years since the Flood, we may easily bring all sober or probable accounts of the *Aegyptians*, *Babylonians*, and *Chineses*, to begin since the Dispersion at *Babel*. Thus having expressed at last the time, so far as it is necessary to be known, I shall conclude this second Consideration of the nature and notion of *Creation*.

* By the Greeks called *ῥησάι*, which are successions of generations from father to son: as in *S. Mat. i. 17*. Indeed sometimes they take it for other spaces of time as *Artemidorus*

observes, for 7 years. *Kal* *ἐνός ἔτους*

ἐπὶ τῷ ὅδῳ καὶ λέγουσιν οἱ ἱατροὶ, ὅτι δύο ῥησάι (not *ῥησάι*, as *Volpius* and *Portus* would correct it) *ἑξήκοντα* (not *μὴ δέξαι*, as *Suidas*) *φασκεόμεν*, τὴν τεσσαρεσκαίδεκάτην (not *τεσσαρεσκαίδεκατον*, as *Suidas* transcribing him negligently) *λέγουσιν*. Sometimes they interpret it 20, 25, or 30 years, as appears by *Hesychius*. And by that last account they reckoned the years of *Nestor*. *Kal* *ἐνός ἔτους* ὅτι τὸν *Nestora* βέλονται εἰς ἐνενήκοντα ἐτη γεγονέναι. So *Artemidorus* and the *Grammarians*. Although I cannot imagine that to be the sense of *Homer*, *Il. α'.*

τῶν δὲ δύο ῥησάι *ἑξήκοντα* ἀνθρώπων *ἑξήκοντα*, οἱ αὖτε δύο *ἑξήκοντα* *ἑξήκοντα* ἔτη ἔχοντες.

And I conceive that gloss in *Hesychius*, *Ἐν διασμάτῳ ῥησάι καὶ αὐτὴ βεβαιώσεται*, to be far more properly applicable to this place. But, in the sense of which now we speak, it is taken for the third part ordinariety of an hundred years: as *Herodotus*, mentioning the *Aegyptian* feigned genealogies; *Καὶ τὴν τεσσάρων ῥησάι δυνάμει μύρια ἑπτα*, 300 generations equallize 10000 years, *ῥησάι δὲ τρεῖς ἀνδρῶν ἑκάστῳ ἑπτα ἔτη*. And after him *Clement Alex. Strom. l. 2.* *Εἰς τὰ ἑκατὶν ἐτη τρεῖς καὶ τεσσαρὶν ῥησάι*.

Now being under the terms of *heaven and earth* we have proved all things beside God to be contained, and that the making of all these things was a clear production of them out of nothing; the third part of the explication must of necessity follow, that he which made all things is God. This truth is so evident in it self, and so confessed by all men, that none did ever assert the World was made, but withall affirmed that it was God who made it. There remaineth therefore nothing more in this particular, then to assert God so the Creatour of the World as he is described in this Article.

Being then we believe in God the Father, maker of heaven and earth, and by that God we expressed already a singularity of the Deity; our first assertion which we must make good is, That the one God did create the World. Again, being whosoever is that God cannot be excluded from this act of Creation, as being an emanation of the Divinity, and we seem by these words to appropriate it to the Father, beside whom we shall hereafter shew that we believe some other persons to be the same God; it will be likewise necessary to declare the reason why the Creation of the World is thus signally attributed to God the Father.

The first of these deserves no explication of it self, it is so obvious to all which have any true conception of God. But because it hath been formerly denied, (as there is nothing so senseless, but some kind of Hereticks have embraced, and may be yet taken up in times of which we have no reason to presume better then of the former) I shall briefly declare the Creation of the World to have been performed by that one God, the Father of our Lord *Jesus Christ*.

As for the first, there is no such difference between things of the world, as to infer a diversity of makers of them, nor is the least or worst of creatures in their original any way derogatory to the Creatour. God saw every thing that he had made, and behold it was very good, and consequently like to come from the fountain of all goodness, and fit always to be ascribed to the same. Whatsoever is evil, is not so by the Creatour's action, but by the creature's defection.

Gen. i. 31.

In

* Inac-
nichens, ut
Deum a con-
ditione ma-
lorum liber-
ret, alterum
mali inducit
autorem.
S. Hier. in
Nahum c. 3.

† For we must
not look upon
Manes as the
first author

of the Heresie, though they which followed him were called from him Manichæans. Nor must we be satisfied with the relation of So-
crates, who allows the beginning of that Heresie μακρόν χρόνον ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ Κωνσταντίνου, a little before Constantine; since Epi-
phanus asserts the first Author of it, σέλλεσθαι τὴν πορείαν ἐπὶ τῷ Ἰερουσαλὴμ ἀπὸ τοῦ χρόνου τοῦ Ἀντιστράτου, to have gone to
Jerusalem even about the Apostles times. Manes then, formerly called Cubricus, (not Uebicus, as S. Aug.) who disseminated this
Heresie in the days of Aurelianus or Probus the Emperor, about the year 277, had a Prediscessor, though not a Master, called first
Terebinthus, after Buddas. For this Buddas left his books and estate to a widow, who, saith Epiphanius, συνέβη πάλιν τὸν χρόνον
ἔργου, continued with his estate and books a long time, and at last bought Cubricus for her servant. This Buddas had a former Master
called Scythianus, the first Author of this Heresie. Beside these, between Scythianus and Cubricus there was yet another teacher of the
doctrine, called Zaranas. Ἦν δὲ σὺν τέτρῳ (Μάντι) καὶ πέντε τῶν ἑταίρων διδασκαλῶν ταύτων, Ζωζύβης ἐνὶ ματι, οὐ σὺν αὐτῷ
ἑσθῆτι. If then we insert this Zaranas into the Manichæan Pedigree, and consider the time of the Widow between Buddas and Cu-
brius, and the age of Cubricus, who was then but seven years old, as Socrates testifies, when she resolved to buy him, and discover the
Heresie to him; there will be no reason to doubt of the relation of Epiphanius, that Scythianus began about the Apostolicall times. Nor need
we any of the abatements in the Animadversions of Petrus, much less that redargution of Epiphanius, who cites Origen as an assertor
of the Christian Faith against this Heresie: For though he certainly died before Manes spread his doctrine, yet it was written in several
books before him, not only in the time of Buddas, to whom Socrates attributes them, but of Scythianus, whom S. Cyril and
Epiphanius make the author of them. Neither can it be objected that they were not Manichæans before the appearance of Manes; for I
conceive the name of Manes (thought by the Greeks to be a name taken up by Cubricus and proper to him) not to be any proper or peculiar
name at all, but the general title of Heretick in the Syriack tongue. For I am loth to think that Theodoret or the Author in Suidas were
so far mistaken, when they call Scythianus Manes, as to conceive Cubricus and he were the same person: when we may with much bet-
ter reason conclude that both Scythianus and Cubricus had the same title. For I conceive Manes at first rather a title than a name, from
the Hebrew מן or מנא signifying a Heretick. And although some of the Rabbins derive their מן from Manes, yet others make it
more ancient than he was, referring it to Tzaddick and Baiezbos, called מן ראש החרקים the first or chief Hereticks, who lived 200
years before Christ. Wherefore it is far more rational to assert, that he which began the Heresie of the Manichæans was called מן as a
Heretick in the Oriental tongues, and from thence Μάνης by the Greeks, (to comply with μανία or Madness in their language) then that
Μάνης was first the name of a man counted as Heretick by the Christians, and then made the general name for all Hereticks, and parti-
cularly for the Christians by the Jews. Which being granted, both Scythianus and Cubricus might well at first have the name of Manes,
that is, Heretick. However, the antiquity of that Heresie will appear in the Marcionites, who asserted not in this particular from the
Manichæans. Duos Ponticus Deos affert tanquam duos Symplegadas naufragii sui: quem negare non potuit, id est, creatorem, id
est, nostrum; & quem probare non potuit, id est, suum. Passus infelix hujus præsumptionis insilium de simplici capitulo Do-
minice pronuntiationis, in homines non in Deos disponentis exempla illa bonæ & malæ arboris, quod neque bona males neque
mala bonos proferat fructus. Tertul. l. 1. c. 2. This Marcion lived in the days of Antoninus Pius, and, as Eusebius testifies,
Justin Martyr wrote against him. Hist. l. 4. c. 11. Irenæus relates how he spake with Polycarpus Bishop of Smyrna, who was taught
by the Apostles, and conversed with divers which saw our Saviour, l. 3. c. 3. Neither was Marcion the first which taught it at Rome,
for he received it from Cerdo. Habuit & Cerdonem quendam informatorem scandali hujus, quo facilius duos Deos exco-
nimaverunt. This Cerdo succeeded Heraclon, and so at last this Heresie may be reduced to the Gnosticks, who derived it from the old
Gentile Philosophers, and might well be embraced by Manes in Persia, because it was the doctrine of the Persian Magi, as Aristotle tes-
tifies. Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν περὶ τοῦ θεοῦ φιλοσοφίας καὶ περὶ οὐρανοῦ (τὸν Μάνης) ἐν τῷ Αἰγυπτίῳ, καὶ οὐ κατὰ αὐτὸν ἐν ἀρχαῖς, ἀνα-
δόντα δαίμονα καὶ κακὸν δαίμονα. Laert. in proæmio. And this derivation is well observed by Timotheus Presbyter of Constantinople,
speaking thus of Manes: Παρεστὶ Μανίων καὶ τῶν ἀπὸ αὐτοῦ ἀποχρησίων καὶ δοκούντων καὶ τῶν κατὰ Περσίδα μάγων ἀπορρητῶν
λαλῶν δογματίζοντων ἀρχαῖς.

Whereas there is no Nature originally full, no substance in it self evil,—
and therefore no Being which may not come from the same fountain of good-
ness. I form the light, and create darkness; I make peace, and create evil; I the
Lord doe all these things, saith he who also said, I am the Lord, and there is none
else, there is no God besides me. Vain then is that conceit which framed two
Gods, one of them called Light, the other Darkness; one good, the other
evil; refuted in the first words of the Creed, I believe in God, maker of heaven
and earth.

But as we have already proved that one God to be the Father, so must we
yet farther shew that one God the Father to be the Maker of the World. In
which there is no difficulty at all: the whole Church at Jerusalem hath suffi-
ciently declared this truth in their devotions; Lord, thou art God which hast
made heaven and earth, and the sea, and all that in them is: against thy holy child
Jesus

Jesus, whom thou hast anointed, both Herod and Pontius Pilate with the Gentiles and the people of Israel were gathered together. Jesus then was the child of that God which made the Heaven and the earth, and consequently the Father of Christ is the Creatour of the World. Matt. 27. 4.

We know that *Christ* is the light of the Gentiles, by his own interpretation; we are assured likewise that his Father gave him, by his frequent assertion: we may then as certainly conclude that the Father of *Christ* is the Creatour of the World, by the Prophet's express prediction: For, *thus saith God the Lord, he that created the heavens and stretched them out, he which spread forth the earth, and that which cometh out of it; I the Lord have called thee in righteousness, and will hold thine hand, and will keep thee, and give thee for a covenant of the people, for a light of the Gentiles.* Isa. 42. 5, 6.

And now this great facility may seem to create the greater difficulty: for being the Apostles teach us that the Son made all things, and the Prophets, that by the Spirit they were produced, how can we attribute that peculiarly in the Creed unto the Father, which in the Scriptures is assigned indifferently to the Son and to the Spirit? Two reasons may particularly be rendered of this peculiar attributing the work of Creation to the Father. First, in respect of those Heresies arising in the infancy of the Church, which endeavoured to destroy this truth, and to introduce another Creatour of the World, distinguished from the Father of our Lord *Jesus Christ*. An Error so destructive to the Christian Religion, that it raseth even the foundations of the Gospel, which refers it self wholly to the promises in the Law, and pretends to no other God but that God of *Abraham*, of *Isaac*, and of *Jacob*; acknowledgeth no other speaker by the Son, then him that spake by the Prophets; and therefore whom *Moses* and the Prophets call Lord of Heaven and earth, of him our blessed Saviour signifies himself to be the Son, rejoycing in spirit, and saying, *I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth.* Secondly, in respect of the Paternal priority in the Deity, by reason whereof that which is common to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, may be rather attributed to the Father, as the first Person in the Trinity. In which respect the Apostle hath made a distinction in the phrase of emanation or production: *To us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him.* And our Saviour hath acknowledged, *The Son can doe nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father doe;* which speaketh some kind of priority in action, according to that of the Person. And in this sense the Church did always profess to believe in God the Father, * Creatour of Heaven and earth. Luke 10. 21.

The great necessity of professing our faith in this particular appeareth several ways, as indispensably tending to the illustration of God's glory, the humiliation of mankind, the provocation to obedience, the aversion from iniquity, and all consolation in our duty.

God is of himself infinitely glorious, because his perfections are absolute, his excellencies indefective: and the splendour of this glory appeareth unto us in and through the works of his hands. ^a *The invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternall power and Godhead.* ^b *For he hath made the earth by his power, he hath established the world by his wisdom, and hath stretched out the heavens by his discretion.* After a long enumeration of the wonderfull works of the Creation, the Psalmist breaketh forth into this pious meditation, ^c *O Lord, how manifold are thy works! in wisdom hast thou made them all.* If then the glory of God be made apparent by the Creation, if he have ^d *made all things for himself,* that is, for the manifestation of his glorious Attributes, if the ^e *Lord rejoyceth*

* Stabat fides
semper in
Creatore &
Christo ejus.
Tertul. adv.
Marcion. l. 1.
Non alia ag-
noscenda e-
rit traditio
Apostolorum,
quam quæ
hodie apud
ipsorum Ec-
clesias edi-
tur. Nullam
autem Apo-
stolici census
Ecclesiam in-
venias quæ
non in Crea-
tore Christi-
anizer. lb.
^a Rom. 1. 20.
^b Jer. 10. 12.
and 51. 15.
^c Ps. 104. 24.
^d Pro. 16. 4.
^e Ps. 104. 31.

in his works, because his glory shall endure for ever; then is it absolutely necessary we should confess him Maker of heaven and earth, that we may sufficiently praise and glorifie him. Let them praise the name of the Lord, saith David, for his name alone is excellent, his glory is above the earth and heaven. Thus did the Levites teach the Children of Israel to glorifie God: Stand up, and bless the Lord your God for ever and ever: and blessed be thy glorious name, which is exalted above all blessing and praise. Thou, even thou art Lord alone; thou hast made heaven, the heaven of heavens, with all their hosts, the earth and all things that are therein. And the same hath S. Paul taught us: For of him, and through him, and to him are all things, to whom be glory for ever, Amen. Furthermore, that we may be assured that he which made both Heaven and earth will be glorified in both, the Prophet calls upon all those celestial hosts to bear their part in this hymn: Praise ye him all his Angels, praise ye him all his hosts. Praise ye him Sun and Moon, praise him all ye Stars of light. Praise him ye heavens of heavens, and ye waters that be above the heavens. Let them praise the name of the Lord, for he commanded, and they were created. And the 24 Elders in the Revelation of S. John fall down before him that sitteth on the throne, and worship him that liveth for ever and ever, and cast their crowns, the emblems of their borrowed and derived glories, before the Throne, the seat of infinite and eternall Majesty, saying, Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory, and honour, and power, for thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure they are and were created. Wherefore, if the heavens declare the glory of God, and all his works praise him; then shall his Saints bless him, they shall speak of the glory of his kingdom, and talk of his power. And if man be silent, God will speak; while we through ingratitude will not celebrate, he himself will declare it, and promulgate, I have made the earth, the man and the beast that are upon the ground, by my great power, and by my out-stretched arm.

Psal. 148. 13.
Neh. 9. 5, 6.
Rom. 11. 36.
Psal. 148. 2, 3, 4, 5.
Revel. 4. 10, 11.
Psal. 19. 1.
Psal. 145. 10, 11.
Jer. 27. 5.

Secondly, the Doctrine of the World's Creation is most properly effectual towards man's Humiliation. As there is nothing more destructive to humanity then Pride, and yet not any thing to which we are more prone then that; so nothing can be more properly applied to abate the swelling of our proud conceptions, then a due consideration of the other works of God, with a sober reflexion upon our own original. *When I consider the heavens, the work of thy fingers, the moon and the stars which thou hast ordained; when I view those glorious apparent bodies with my eye, and by the advantage of a glass find greater numbers, before beyond the power of my sight, and from thence judge there may be many millions more which neither eye nor instrument can reach; when I contemplate those far more glorious spirits, the inhabitants of the Heavens, and attendants on thy throne; I cannot but break forth into that admiration of the Prophet, What is man, that thou art mindfull of him? what is that offspring of the earth, that dust and ashes? what is that son of man, that thou visitest him? what is there in the progeny of an ejected and condemned Father, that thou shouldest look down from Heaven, the place of thy dwelling, and take care or notice of him? But if our Original ought so far to humble us, how should our Fall abase us? That of all the creatures which God made, we should comply with him who first opposed his Maker, and would be equal unto him from whom he new received his Being. All other works of God, which we think inferiour to us, because not furnished with the light of understanding, or endued with the power of election, are in a happy impossibility of sinning, and so offending of their Maker: The glorious spirits which attend upon the throne of God, once in a condition of themselves to fall, now by the grace of God preserved, and placed beyond all possibility of sinning, are entred upon the greatest happiness of which the workmanship of God*

Psal. 8. 3.

March

God is capable: But Men, the sons of fall'n Adam, and sinners after the similitude of him, of all the creatures are the onely companions of those *Angels* *Jude 7. 6.* which left their own habitations, and are delivered into chains of darknes, to be reserved unto judgement. *2 Pet. 2. 4.* How should a serious apprehension of our own corruption, mingled with the thoughts of our creation, humble us in the sight of him, whom we alone of all the creatures by our unrepented sins drew unto Repentance? How can we look without confusion of face upon that monument of our infamy, recorded by *Moses*, who first penned the original of Humanity, *It repented the Lord that he had made man on the earth, and it grieved him at his heart?* *Gen. 6. 6.*

Thirdly, this Doctrine is properly efficacious and productive of most chearfull and universal Obedience. It made the Prophet call for the Commandments of God, and earnestly desire to know what he should obey. *Thy hands have made me and fashioned me: give me understanding, that I may learn thy commandments.* *Psal. 119. 73.* By virtue of our first production, God hath undeniably absolute dominion over us, and consequently there must be due unto him the most exact and compleat obedience from us. Which reason will appear more convincing, if we consider, of all the creatures which have been derived from the same fountain of God's goodness, none ever disobeyed his voice but the Devil and Man. *Mine hand, saith he, hath laid the foundation of the earth, and my right hand hath spann'd the heavens; when I call unto them they stand up together.* *Isa. 48. 13.* The most loyal and obedient servants which stand continually before the most illustrious Prince are not so ready to receive and execute the commands of their Sovereign Lord, as all the hosts of Heaven and earth to attend upon the will of their Creatour. *Lift up your eyes on high, and behold who hath created these things, that bringeth out their hosts by number: he calleth them all by names, by the greatness of his might, for that he is strong in power, not one faileth, but every one maketh his appearance, ready prest to observe the designs of their Commander in chief.* *Isa. 40. 26.* Thus the Lord commanded, and they fought from heaven, the stars in their courses fought against Sifera. *Jud. 5. 20.* He commanded the Ravens to feed Elias, and they brought him bread and flesh in the morning, and bread and flesh in the evening; and so one Prophet lived merely upon the obedience of the Fowls of the air. *1 King. 17. 43.* He spake to the devouring Whale, and it vomited out Jonah upon the dry land; and so another Prophet was delivered from the jaws of death by the obedience of the Fishes of the sea. *Jonah 2. 10.* Do we not reade of fire and hail, snow and vapour, stormy wind fulfilling his word? Shall there be a greater coldness in man then in the snow? more vanity in us then in a vapour? more inconstancy then in the wind? If the universal obedience of the creature to the will of the Creatour cannot move us to the same affection and desire to serve and please him, they will all conspire to testifie against us and condemn us, when God shall call unto them, saying, *Hear, O heavens, and give ear, O earth, for the Lord hath spoken: I have nourished and brought up children, and they have rebelled against me.* *Isa. 1. 2.*

Lastly, the Creation of the World is of most necessary meditation for the Consolation of the servants of God in all the variety of their conditions. *Happily is he whose hope is in the Lord his God, which made heaven and earth, the sea and all that therein is.* *Psal. 146. 5, 6.* This happiness consisteth partly in a full assurance of his power to secure us, his ability to satisfie us. *The earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof, the world and they that dwell therein. For he hath founded it upon the seas, and established it upon the floods.* *Psal. 24. 1, 2.* By virtue of the first production he hath a perpetuall right unto and power to dispose of all things: and he which can order and dispose of all must necessarily be esteemed able to secure and satisfie any Creature. *Hast thou not known, hast thou not heard that the* *Isa. 40. 28.*

Psal. 121.

2, 3.

Job 10. 3.

Isa. 54. 16,

17.

everlasting God, the Lord, the Creatour of the ends of the earth, fainteth not, neither is weary? There is no externall resistance or opposition where Omnipotency worketh, no internall weakness or defection of power where the Almighty is the Agent; and consequently there remaineth a full and firm persuasion of his ability in all conditions to preserve us. Again, this happiness consisteth partly in a comfortable assurance, arising from this Meditation, of the will of God to protect and succour us, of his desire to preserve and bless us. *My help cometh from the Lord, who made heaven and earth: He will not suffer thy foot to be moved,* saith the Prophet *David*; at once expressing the foundation of his own expectancy and our security. *God will not despise the work of his hands,* neither will he suffer the rest of his Creatures to doe the least injury to his own image. *Behold,* saith he, *I have created the smith that bloweth the coals in the fire, and that bringeth forth an instrument for his work. No weapon that is formed against thee shall prosper. This is the heritage of the servants of the Lord.*

Wherefore to conclude our explication of the first Article, and to render a clear account of the last part thereof, that every one may understand what it is I intend, when I make confession of my faith in the *Maker of heaven and earth*, I do truly profess, that I really believe, and am fully persuaded, that both Heaven and earth and all things contained in them have not their being of themselves, but were made in the beginning; that the manner by which all things were made was by mediate or immediate creation; so that antecedently to all things beside, there was at first nothing but God, who produced most part of the World merely out of nothing, and the rest out of that which was formerly made of nothing. This I believe was done by the most free and voluntary act of the will of God, of which no reason can be alledged, no motive assigned, but his goodness; performed by the determination of his will at that time which pleased him, most probably within one hundred and thirty generations of men, most certainly within not more then six, or at farthest seven, thousand years. I acknowledge this God Creatour of the World to be the same God who is the Father of our Lord *Jesus Christ*: and in this full latitude, *I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth.*

ARTICLE II.

And in Jesus Christ, his onely Son, our Lord.

* Job. 14. 1.

* 1 Job. 3. 23.

* Eadem Regula veritatis

docet nos

credere post

Patrem etiam

in Filium

Dei, Christi-

sum Jesum,

Dominum

Deum no-

strum, sed

Dei Filium;

hujus Dei

qui & unus

& solus est,

conditor sci-

licet rerum

omnium.

Nocat. de

Trinit. 6. 9.

THE second Article of the *Creed* presents unto us, as the object of our Faith, the second Person of the blessed Trinity; that as in the Divinity there is nothing intervening between the Father and the Son, so that immediate union might be perpetually expressed by a constant conjunction in our Christian Confession. And that upon no less authority then of the *Authour and Finisber of our Faith*, who in the persons of the Apostles gave this command to us, *Ye believe in God, believe also in me.* Nor speaketh he this of himself, but from the Father which sent him: *for this is his commandment, that we should believe on the name of his Son Jesus Christ.* According therefore to the Son's prescription, the Father's injunction, and the Sacramental institution, as we are baptized, so do we * believe in the name of the Father, and the Son.

Our blessed Saviour is here represented under a threefold description: first, by his Nomination, as *Jesus Christ*; secondly, by his Generation, as the *onely Son of God*; thirdly, by his Dominion, as *our Lord*.

But

But when I refer *Jesus Christ* to the Nomination of our Saviour, because he is in the Scriptures promiscuously and indifferently sometimes called *Jesus*, sometimes *Christ*, I would be understood so as not to make each of them equally, or in like propriety, his Name. ^a *His name was called Jesus, which was so named of the Angel before he was conceived in the womb;* ^b *who is also called Christ, not by * name, but by office and title.* Which observation, seemingly trivial, is necessary for the full explication of this part of the Article: for by this distinction we are led unto a double notion, and so resolve our Faith into these two Propositions. I believe there was and is a man, whose name was actually, and is truly in the most high importance, *Jesus*, the Saviour of the world. I believe the man who bare that name to be the *Christ*, that is, the *Messias* promised of old by God, and expected by the *Jews*.

^a Luke 1. 21.
^b Matt. 1. 16.
* Si tamen nomen est Christus, & non appellatio potius; unde enim significatur. Unctus autem non magis nomen est quam vestitus, quam

calceatus, accedens nomini res. Tertul. adv. Prax. c. 28. Quorum nominum alterum est proprium, quod ab Angelo impositum est; alterum accedens, quod ab unctione convenit. Ibid. Christus commune dignitatis est nomen, Jesus proprium vocabulum Salvatoris. S. Hieron. in Matt. 16. 20. Jesus inter homines nominatur; nam Christus non proprium nomen est, sed nuncupatio potestatis & regni. Lactan. de Falsa Sap. l. 4. c. 7. Dum dicitur Christus, commune nomen dignitatis est; dum Jesus Christus, proprium vocabulum Salvatoris est. Isidor. Orig. l. 7. c. 2. Ἰησοῦς καλεῖται σωτήρας. S. Cyril. Catech. 10.

For the first, it is undoubtedly the proper name of our Saviour given unto him, according to the custome of the *Jews*, at his Circumcision: and as the Baptist was called *John*, even so the *Christ* was called *Jesus*. Beside, as the imposition was after the vulgar manner, so was the name it self of ordinary use. We read in the Scriptures of ^a *Jesus which was called Justus, a fellow-worker with S. Paul;* and of ^b *a certain sorcerer, a Jew, whose name was Barjesus, that is, the son of Jesus.* Josephus in his History mentioneth one *Jesus* the son of *Ananias*, another the son of *Saphates*, a third the son of *Judas*, slain in the Temple: and many of the high Priests, or Priests, were called by that name; as the son of *Damneus*, of *Gamaliel*, of *Onias*, of *Phabes*, and of *Thebuth*. Ecclesiasticus is called the Wisdome of *Jesus* the son of *Sirach*, and that *Sirach* the son of another *Jesus*. ^c *S. Steven* speaks of the *Tabernacle of witness brought in with Jesus into the possession of the Gentiles*: and the Apostle in his explication of those words of *David*, *To day if ye will hear his voice, observeth, that* ^e *if Jesus had given them rest, then would he not afterwards have spoken of another day.* Which two Scriptures being undoubtedly understood of *Joshua* the son of *Nun*, teach us as infallibly that *Jesus* is the same name with *Joshua*. Which being at the first * imposition in the full extent of pronunciation *Jehoshuah*, in procelle of time contracted to *Jeshuah*, by the omission of the last letter, (strange and difficult to other languages) and the addition of the Greek termination, became *Jesus*.

^a Col. 4. 11.
^b Act. 13. 6.
Habuit & Judæa quosdam *Jesus*, quorum vacuis gloriatur vocabulis. Illa enim nec lucent, nec pascunt, nec medentur. Bernard. in Cast. Sermon. 15.

^c Act. 7. 45.
^e Heb. 4. 8.

* First יְהוֹשֻׁעַ, as generally in the Books of Moses, is *Joshua*, Judges, Samuel, the Kings, yea even in Haggai and Zachariah: then contracted into יֵשׁוּעַ, as in the 1 Chron.

24. 11. 2 Chron. 31. 15. and constantly in Ezra and Nehemiah. Next the last letter *y* was but

Wherefore it will be necessary, for the proper interpretation of *Jesus*, to look back upon the first that bare that name, who was the son of *Nun*, of the tribe of *Ephraim*, the succellour of *Moses*, and so named by him, as it is written, ^d *And Moses called Oshea the son of Nun Jehoshua.* His first name then imposed at his circumcision was *Oshea*, or *Hoseah*; the same with the name of the ^e *son of Azaziah, ruler of Ephraim*, of the ^f *son of Elah, king of Israel*, of the ^g *son of Beeri, the Prophet*: and the interpretation of this first name ^h *Hoseah* is

lightly pronounced, as appears by the Greek Translation 1 Chron. 7. 27. where יְהוֹשֻׁעַ is rendered in the Roman and Alexandrian Copy Ἰωσὴ, in the Aldus and Complutensian Editions Ἰωσὴ, and by Eusebius, who expresseth it truer than those Copies, Ἰωσὴ. At last *y* was totally left out both in the pronunciation and the writing, and the whole name of *Joshuah* contracted to *W*. ^d Nam. 13. 16. ^e 1 Chron. 27. 20. ^f 2 King. 17. 1. ^g Hos. 1. 1. ^h *Os* in lingua nostra Salvatorem sonat, quod nomen habuit etiam Josue filius Nun, antequam ei à Deo vocabulum mutaretur. S. Hier. in Osee c. 1. v. 1. & l. 1. adv. Jovinianum. Intrude indeed of other interpretations among the Greeks, no good expositors of the Hebrew names: as in an ancient MS. of the LXX Translation of the Prophets, now in the Library of Cardinal Barberini, at the beginning of *Hoseah*, Ὠσὴ, ἡμετέριος. and again, Ὠσὴ, ἡμετέριος. (Of which the first and last are far from the Original; and the middle agreeable with the root, not with the conjugation, as being deduced from *W* not in Niphal, but in Hiphil.) And in another MS. of the Prophets in the King's Library at S. James's, Ὠσὴ, ἐκείνου, ἡμετέριος. which is the interpretation inserted into Helethius; in whom for Ὠσὴ we must read Ὠσὴ and so I suppose Sabasius intended it, though the Holland Edition hath made his Emendation Ὠσὴ, Saviour.

As the Samaritan Pentateuch makes it the same name, which he was first named, and which he had afterwards;

as if Moses had only called Hosea, Oseia. † So Justin Martyr speaks of Hoseah as μετονομασθέντος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ὀνόματι. And comparing it with that alteration of Jacob's name to Ἰσραὴλ ἐπικληθέντι ἑσθῆν, & τὸ Ἀβραὰμ ὀνομα Ἰσὺς ἐπικληθέντι, where, to pass by his mistake in supposing him first named Israel, and after called Jacob, he makes the alteration of Hoseah to Joshua equal to that of Jacob to Israel. The reason whereof was the Greek version of the name, who for Hoseah translated it Ἀβραὰμ Ἰσὺς τὴν Ἀβρὰμ ὀνὸν Νάωη Ἰησοῦν, Num. 13. 16. Dum Moyli successor destinaretur Aules filius Nave, transfertur certe de pristino nomine, & incipit vocari Jesus. Tertull. adv. Jud. & adv. Marcion. l. 3. §. 16. Igitur Moyses his administratis Aufem quendam nomine præponens populo, qui eos revocaret ad patriam terram. Clem. l. 1. Recognit. Qui cum primum Aules vocaretur, Moyses iussit eum Jesum vocari. Lactant. de Vera Sap. c. 17. Οὐ αὖτις πρὸς γὰρ (Μαυσῆος) τὴν αὐτὴν διδόντων τῇ τῷ Ἰησοῦ κληθέντων αὐτοῦ, ὀνόματι Ἰσὺς ἐπὶ τῷ Ἀβραὰμ, καλεῖσθαι, Ἰησοῦν αὐτὸς ἀναγορεύει. Euseb. Eccl. Hist. l. 1. c. 3. Thus was the Hoseah something disguised by Aules, and was farther estranged yet by those which frequently called him Νάωης, as Euseb. Demonst. Ev. l. 5. c. 17. thence. * This Justin Martyr charges upon the Jews as neglected it then, and affirms the reason why they received not Jesus for the Christ, was their not observing the alteration of Hoseah into Josua or Jesus. Αὐτοὺς καλεῖσθαι Ἰησοῦν Μαυσῆος ἐκείνου. ὅτε οὐδ' ἐκείνους δι' αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τῶν, ἐκ διαπορέας, ἑδὲ φιλονεικίας. τῶν αὐτῶν λέγειν σὺ δὲ Χριστός, & ἀναγινώσκοντες ὁ σωτὴρ. And whereas they spoke much of the change made in the names of Abram and Sarai, which were but of a letter, they took no notice of this total alteration of the name: so he, Διὰ τὴν αὐτὴν ἀλφά πρῶτον αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τῷ Ἀβραὰμ ὀνόματι διολογείτο, & διὰ τὴν αὐτὴν πρῶτον τῷ Σάρραι ὀνόματι διολογείτο, διὰ τὴν αὐτὴν αὐτῶν ὀνομα τῷ Ἀβραὰμ τῷ Ἰησοῦ ὀνὸν Νάωη ἔλον μετονομασθαι τῷ Ἰησοῦ, & ἐκείνους. It here, to pass by the vulgar mistake of the Greeks, who generally deliver the addition of α in the name of Abraham, and ρ in the name of Sarah, when the first was an addition of ρ, the second a change of ρ into λ, he would make that of Hoseah into Jesus a far more considerable alteration than that of Abram or of Sarah.

דָּוִשׁ *
דָּוִשׁ

† For it may well be thought that is added to make the name דָּוִשׁ the same with the third person of the future in Hiphil. For although the characteristical letter of the conjugation Hiphil be excluded in the future tense, and so the regular word be דָּוִשׁ frequently in use; yet sometimes it is expressed, as it is used 1 Sam. 17. 47.

לֹא בַחֲבֵר

וְיִשְׁעִי וְיִשְׁעִי, And all the assembly shall know that the Lord saveth (or will save) not with sword and spear: and Psal. 116. 6. דָּלוּתִי וְלִי יִשְׁעִי I was brought low, and he helped me. And although there be another י in the future then in the name, yet being it is also found sometimes with the lesser Chiric, and so without the latter י, or without any Chiric at all, as frequently with the addition of י, דָּוִשׁ, there is no reason but דָּוִשׁ, the name of the son of Nun, may be of the same force, as consisting of the same letters, with the third person of the Future in Hiphil. Again, being י added to the Future, as formative thereof, stands in the place of י, (for the avoiding of confusion with conjunctive) which is nothing else than the abbreviation of נָשִׁיב, we may well assign at least this Emphasis to the mutation which Moses made; that whereas before there was nothing but Salvation barely in his name, now there is no less than he shall save, in which the נָשִׁיב or י is a peculiar designation of the person, and the shall or Tense a certainty of the futurition. Thus will the design of Moses appear to be nothing else but a prediction or confirmation of that which was not before, but by way of desire or omination; and this only by changing the Imperative into the Future, וְיִשְׁעִי serves the expectation of the people, into וְיִשְׁעִי servabit, the ratification of Moses. * So did the Ancients understand it: to the Greeks Jesus is σωτήριος Θεός, to the Latines, Salvator Dei. So Eusebius Demonst. Ev. l. 4. ad finem. Ἐπειδὴ ὁ σωτήριος Θεός ἐστὶν τῷ Ἐξ ἀδὰμ γυναικὶ τῷ Ἰησοῦ μετονομασθέντι ὀνομα σημαίνει. Ἰσὺς μὲν γὰρ παρ' Ἑβραίων σωτήρια, ὅς ἐστι Νάωη παρὰ τῶν αὐτῶν Ἰωσὴδ ὀνομασθέντι. Ἰωσὴδ δὲ

δῖον

ὅτι ἰαὼ σωτηρία, τὸτ' ἐστὶ, Ὁσὶ σωτήριον. Where nothing can be more certain than that *Iaō* is taken for the name of God, and *Iaō* *Carmela* together, the salvation of God. And yet Theophylact has strangely mistaken it, *Matth. i. 1.* τὸ Ἰησοῦ ὄνομα ἔχον Ἐβραίων δὲν, ἀλλ' Ἐβραίων, ἐβραϊστί, ὃ ὡς ἰαὼ, ἰαὼ δὲ ἡ *Carmela* παρ' Ἑβραίων λέγεται, which words seem plainly to signify that Jesus is interpreted Saviour, because *Iaō* in the Hebrew tongue signifies Salvation. I confess the words may be strained to the same sense with those of Eusebius, but not without some force, and contrary to what he seemeth to intend. Especially considering those which followed him in the same mistake, as Meschopulus *ὅτι ἰαὼ, ἰησοῦς δὲ τὸ ἰαὼ ἰησοῦς, ὃ ἰαὼ παρ' Ἑβραίων τὴν *Carmela*.* Whereas *Iaō* in Eusebius is certainly no other than *יְהוָה*, and *Iaō* then *יְהוֹשֻׁעַ*, and so *Iaō*, contracted of *Iaō* *Iaō*, the salvation of God. Nor is this only the opinion of Eusebius, but of S. Hierome, a man much better acquainted with the Hebrew language; who on the first Chapter of *Hoseab*, shewing that *Josuah* had first the same name with that of the Prophet, saith, Non enim (ut male in Græcis codicibus legitur & Latinis) *Ause* dictus est, quod nihil omnino intelligitur; sed *Osee*, id est, Salvator: & additum est ejus nomini Dominus, ut Salvator Domini diceretur. What then was it but *יְהוָה* the Dominus added to his name? For as in the name of *Elias* S. Hierome acknowledgeth the addition of the name of God, Interpretatur autem *Elias* Salvator Domini; in the same manner did he conceive it in the name of *Josuah*, only with this difference, that in the one it begins, in the other concludes the name.

Now being we have thus declared that *Jesus* is the same name with *Josuah*, being the name of *Josuah* was first imposed by Divine designation, as a certain prediction of the fulfilling to the *Israelites*, by the person which bare the name, all which was signified by the name, being *Jesus* was likewise named by a more immediate imposition from Heaven, even by the ministration of an Angel; it followeth, that we believe he was infallibly designed by God to perform unto the sons of men whatsoever is implied in his nomination. As therefore in *Hoseab* there was expressed Salvation, in *Josuah* at least was added the designation of that single person to save, with certainty of preservation, and probably even the name of God, by whose appointment and power he was made a Saviour; so shall we find the same in *Jesus*. In the first salutation, the Angel *Gabriel* told the blessed Virgin, she should conceive in her womb, and bring forth a son, and should call his name *Jesus*. In the Dream of *Joseph* the Angel of the Lord informed him not onely of the nomination, but of the interpretation or * Etymology; *Thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins.* In which words is clearly expressed the designation of the person, *He*, and the futurity of Salvation certain by him, *he shall save*. Beside, that other addition of the name of God, propounded in *Josuah* as probable, appeareth here in some degree above probability, and that for two reasons. First, because it is not barely said that *He*, but, as the Original raiseth it, † *He himself shall save*. *Josuah* saved *Israel* not by his own power, not of himself, but God by him; neither saved he his own people, but the people of God: whereas *Jesus* himself, by his own power, the power of God, shall save his own people, the people of God. Well therefore may we understand the interpretation of his name to be *God the Saviour*. Secondly, immediately upon the prediction of the name of *Jesus*, and the interpretation given by the Angel, the Evangelist expressly observeth, ^a *All this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the Prophet, saying, Behold, a Virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel, which, being interpreted, is, God with us.* Several ways have been invented to shew the fulfilling of that prophecy, notwithstanding our Saviour was not called *Emmanuel*; but none can certainly appear more proper, then that the sense of *Emmanuel* should be comprehended in the name of *Jesus*: and what else is *God with us*, then *God our Saviour*? Well therefore hath the Evangelist conjoined * the Prophet and the Angel asserting *Christ* was therefore named *Jesus*, because it was foretold he should be called *Emmanuel*, the Angelical *God the Saviour* being in the highest propriety the Prophetical *God with us*.

However, the constant Scripture-interpretation of this name is *Saviour*. So said the Angel of the Lord to the amazed Shepherds, ^b *Unto you is born this day in the City of David a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord.* So S. Paul to the Jews and Gentile Profelytes at *Antioch*, ^c *Of this man's seed hath God, according*

Luke i. 31.

* *Jesus* Hebræo sermone Salvator dicitur. Etymologiam ergo nominis ejus Evangelista signavit, dicens, Vocabis nomen ejus *Jesus*, quia ipse saluum faciet populum suum. S. Hier. † *Autē*, ipse.

^a *Matth. i. 22, 23.*

* *Βλέπων* *ισαΐαν* *Εὐαγγελιστὴν* *χ.* *περὶ* *ῥήματος* *μὲθ-* *ερμηνεύ-* *οντος* *τὸ* *μὲθ'* *ἡμῶν* *ὁ* *Θεός*, *ὃ* *ὅτι* *σωτηρία* *τῷ* *λαῷ*, *τὸ* *μὲθ'* *ἡμῶν* *δε-* *σποτῶν* *ἡμῶν* *λογησέ-*

Andreas Cretensis in Circumc.

^b *Luk. 2. 11.*
^c *Act. 13.*

23.

10 *And* the
 chief of them
 was most nu-
 merous wor-
 shipped under
 this title, En-
 chelmas makes
 Amphitryo
 setting by his
 Altar, which
 Hercules had
 built, Βαυδὲ
 κατὰ τὸν
 Σωτῆρα
 Διός. And
 Aristophanes
 introduces
 Bacchus
 swearing, Νά
 τιν' ἑστίασεν
 Σωτῆρα as if
 it were the
 familiar Oath
 among the

ding to his promise, raised unto Israel a Saviour, Jesus. Which explication of this sacred Name was not more new or strange unto the world, then was the Name it self so often used before. For the ancient *Græcians* usually gave it at first as a title to their * Gods, whom after any remarkable preservations they styled *Saviours*, and under that notion built Temples and consecrated Altars to them. Nor did they rest with their mistaken piety, but made it stoop unto their baser flattery, calling those men their † *Saviours* for whom they seemed to have as great respect and honour as for their gods.

Nor does it always signifie so much as that it may not be attributed to man : for even in the Scriptures the Judges of *Israel* were called no less then their *Saviours*. ^a *When the children of Israel cried unto the Lord, the Lord raised up a deliverer to the children of Israel, who delivered them, even Othniel the son of Kenaz. And again, When they cried unto the Lord, the Lord raised them up a deliverer, Ehud the son of Gera.* Where though in our Translation we call *Othniel* and *Ehud* Deliverers; yet in the Original they are plainly termed * *Saviours*.

Athenians, as well it might be, he having his Temple in their Piræum, as Strabo testifieth, l. 9. (where Demosthenes by virtue of a Decree was to build him an Altar, Plut. in Vita Demosth.) and his Porch in the City, which was called indeed vulgarly τῷ Ἐλευθερίῳ Διὸς σταῖ, yet was it also named τῷ Σωτήρι, as Harpocration and Heyschius have observed. Ὁ πρὶ ἐπιμήλειαν τῷ Σωτρί, ὁνομάζεται ὁ καὶ Ἐλευθερί, ὁ δὲ καὶ Μένειος, so the first. Τῶν Μένων ἐκφυγόντων ἰσχυρότων τῶν Ἐλευθερίω Διᾷ, ὅσων ἦ ἔνιαι, καὶ Σωτρί, φασί, so the latter. As in their oaths, so in their feasts they mentioned him always at the third cup. Τὸν μὲν πρῶτον Διὸς Ὀλυμπίου καὶ Σωτρί, Ὀλυμπίου ἑξερῶν, τὸν δὲ δεύτερον ἠρώων, τὸν δὲ τρίτον Σωτρί, sub. Διός, which is omitted in Hesychius, as appears out of Athenæus, l. 2. & 15. And especially that of Alexis the Comedian: Ἀλλ' ἔγχεον αὐτῷ Διὸς γε πῶς τὴν Σωτρί. Σὼν ὀνητοῖς ἀπάντων χρησιμώτατος πᾶσι Ὁ Ζεὺς ὁ Σωτρί. Pausanias in Corinthiacis, Messenicis, Laconicis & Arcadicis, mentions several Statues and Temples anciently dedicated to Jupiter ἐπικλησιν Σωτρί. And though this title was so generally given to Jupiter, as that Hesychius explains Σωτρί, ὁ Ζεὺς, yet was it likewise attributed to the other Gods: as Herodotus relates how the Grecians in their Naval war against the Persians made their vows Ποσειδέωνι Σωτρί, and that they preferred the title to Neptune in his days, l. 7. And Artemidorus takes notice that Castor and Pollux are taken for the θεοὶ Σωτρί, whom the Poet bearing the name of Orpheus to Mælius calls μεγαλὸν σωτρί, οὗ δὲ Διὸς ἀφῶτα τέκνα, as the Hymn of Homer, Σωτρίας τέκε πᾶσι δὲ ἐπιθυονίαν ἀνδράπων, Ὀκυπόρων τε νεόν, — and Theocritus in the Idyllion on them, Ἀνδρόπων σωτρίας ἐπὶ Ξυφῇ ἦδη ἑόντων. Hence Lucian in Alexandro useth it as their constant title, ἀλεξίγερκα Ἡρώων καὶ, καὶ Ζεὺς Σωτρίας, καὶ Διόνειος Σωτρίας. Neither have we mention of the title only, but of the original and occasion of it. For when Castor and Pollux worshipped the sons of Thebes out of Athens, and made Menelæus King, he gave them first this name, διὰ ταῦτα σωτρί, ὁ Μενελάου ἀνακλὺς τε καὶ Σωτρίας ὠνόμασε. Asian. Var. Hist. l. 4. c. 6. Beside these, we read in the ancient Inscriptions, Ἀπλημὶ Θεῷ Σωτρί, and again, Ἀσκληπιῷ καὶ Ἐγείᾳ Σωτρί. For as they had their Female Deities, so did they attribute this title to their Goddesses, and that both in the masculine and the feminine Gender. As to Venus, Ἀρεσδίτῃ Θεᾷ Παραθαῶ καὶ Σωτρί to Diana, Ἀρτέμιδι Σωτρί, as the same collection of Inscriptions hath it. Thus Pherecrates, Ἡγέμεν τῆς πόλεως ἐπὶ ταύτης Σωτρίας, and Sophocles, Τύχη γε πᾶσι Σωτρί. Thus the Epigram extant in Suidas, Φωσφόρος, ὁ Σωτρί, ὁ Παιδάς, ὁ Ἰσχυρὸς κλέων, Ἀρτεμ. — Οὐδὲν ἦπλον κακίων Σωτρίας καὶ ἀλεξίγερκον προσήρκεον. Theophrast. Serm. 8. § 95. of Hercules. The Bætes, an ancient people in Peloponnesus, Ἀρτεμιν ὀνομάζουσι Σωτρίαν. Paus. in Laconicis. Her Temple and Statue in the City Tæzen was built and named by Thebes as his safe return from Crete. The Argæves preferred by her from the Persians, ἐπὶ τούτῳ Σωτρίας ἀγάλμα ἐπέστησαν Ἀρτέμιδι. and upon the same occasion another of the same bigness set up at Page. Id. But this title (specially was given to Minerva. Σωτρίας ἢ Ἀθηνᾶ πρὸς τοῖς Ἑλλήσιν, Hesych. Ἐπὶ τῷ Ἀθωνίῳ Σωτρίας λεγούσιν, ἢ καὶ Σωσι. Schol. Aristoph. in Kanas. Aristotle in his will obliged Nicator to a dedication Διὶ Σωτρί, Ἀθηνᾶ Σωτρί. Laert. in Vita Arist. And in general they invoked God under the notion of Σωτρί, as Plato in Timæo, Θεὸν καὶ τῷ νυνὶ ἐπὶ ἀρχῇ τῇ ἐκφυγόντων Σωτρίας ἐξ ἀπότης καὶ αἰθέας διηγνήστας πρὸς τὸ καὶ εἰκότων ὄγκμα διασῶζεν ἡ μὲν ὀπλολαοσύνη, πάλιν ἀνέμβατα λήγειν. † This was the constant title of the first Ptolemy, the son of Lagos, given to him by the Rhodians. Ὀνόματι μὲν δὲ καὶ ταῦτα Πτολεμαῖοι ὄρισαν, ἀλλὰ ὅ ἐπικλητοὶ ἄλλω, καὶ γὰρ φιλομαγείᾳ καλῶν, καὶ φιλαδελφονίᾳ πρὸς τὸν καὶ Λόγος Σωτρίας, προσδόντων Ῥωδίων τὸ ὄνομα. Paus. Atticis. which name first given him by the Rhodians was so way expressed in his wife of the Syrians, as is observed by Josephus, ὡς καὶ τὴν Σουλαν ἀπασαν τὴν Πτολεμαίῳ τῷ Λόγῳ Σωτρί, ὅτι χρηματίζοντο καὶ τὰ ἐναντία πθεῖν αὐτῇ τῇ ἐπικλήσει. This was so familiar, that Tertul. useth the title in stead of the name. Postum (c. Alexandrum) regnavit illic in Alexandria Soter annis 35. Thus Antigonus was first called by the Greeks their Εὐεργέτης, or Benefactor, then Σωτρί, or Saviour: καὶ μόνον ἐκρίθη παρ' αὐτῶν τὸν καμῶν Εὐεργέτης, ἀλλὰ καὶ μετὰλλᾳ, Σωτρί. Polyb. l. 5. Thus we read of Demetrius, who restored the Athenians to their liberty: ἀνεκρίσαντες, καὶ βούαντες ἐκείνον ποθεῖν αὐτὸν τὸν ἀμνηστὴν Σωτρί, καὶ Εὐεργέτην ἀναρροδοῦντες. Plut. in vita. And not only so, but named Demetrius and Antigonus among them Dii Soteres; and in stead of their annual Actæon, whose name they used in their distinction of years, they created a Priest of these Dii Soteres, as the same Author testifieth: ἡ μὲν δὲ Σωτρίας ἀνέγραψαν θεῖς, καὶ τὸν ἐπώνυμον καὶ πᾶσιον ἀρχοντα καταπαύσαντες, ἵερα Σωτρίαν ἐχρησάμεν καὶ ἔκαστον ἐνιαυτὸν. Appian relates of Demetrius, that he received this title from the Babylonians. Τιμάρκῃ ἐπαισιάζον ἀνεκλὸν, καὶ πᾶσα πονηρὸς τῆς Βαβυλωνί, ὃν ἡμεῖς καὶ Σωτρί ἀεὶ αὐτῶν τῇ Βαβυλωνίαν ἀνερᾶν. De bell. Syriac. Lucian's mistake in his Salutation tells us of Ἀντίχῳ ὁ Σωτρί, and Appian gives us the routing of the Gauls as the cause of that title: ὅς καὶ Σωτρί ἐπικλήθη Γαλάταις ἐκ τῆς Εὐρώπης ἐκ τῶν Ἀσίων ἐμβαλόντας ἐξ ἐλάσεως. Ibid. And in process of time this title grew so customary and familiar, that the Sicilians bestowed it upon Verres their oppressor. Itaque illum non solum Patronum usus infelix, sed etiam Sotera inferipimus vidi Syraculis, says Cicero, Verin. 2. * Judg. 3. 9. and 3. 15. * Heb. יְשׁוּעָה יְיָ וְיִשְׂרָאֵל לְבָנֵי יְהוֹיָקִים So the Septuagint clearly, καὶ ἡμεῖς καὶ Σωτρίας πᾶσι Ἰσραὴλ, καὶ ἔσωσεν αὐτούς, τὸν Γοθοῖσι καὶ τὸν Κενεῖ. Qui succitavit eis Salvatore, & liberavit eos, Othaniel. Again, καὶ ἡμεῖς καὶ Σωτρίας πᾶσι τῶν Ἀσίων, ὡς ἡμεῖς Ἰσραὴλ. Qui succitavit eis Salvatore vocabulo Aioch, filium Gero, Vit. Transl. upon which place S. Augustine notes, Animadvertendum est autem quod Salvatore dicat etiam hominem, per quem Deus salvos faciat. Quæst. l. 7. c. 18.

Now

Now what the full import and ultimate sense of the Title of *Saviour* might be, seemed not easie to the Ancients: and the * best of the *Latines* thought the *Greek* word so pregnant and comprehensive, that the *Latine* tongue had no single word able to express it.

* So Cicero, in the place before cited, having said before Ver-

res inscribed Sotera, goes on, Hoc quantum est: ita magnum, ut Latino uno verbo exprimi non possit. But though in Cicero's time there was no *Latine* word used in that sense; yet not long after it was familiar. For as in the *Greek* inscriptions we read often Dedications ΔΙΙ ΣΩΤΗΡ, so in the *Latine* we find often Jovi Servatori, or Conservatori, sometimes Jovi Salvatori, or Salutari: all which are nothing else but the *Latine* expressions of the *Greek* inscriptions. And without question Σωτήρ might have been readed Sospitor, and even Solpes, as it was used in the days of Ennius. Solpes, salvus: Ennius tamen sospitem pro servatore posuit. Fissus. Neither indeed could the Sicilians mean any more of Verres by the word Sotera, then Tully spake of himself, when he sty'd himf. l. Servatorem reipub. At least Tacitus did conceive that Conservator is as much as Soter, when speaking of Mithus, who detested the conspiracies to Nero, he saith, Milichus præmiis ditatus Conservatoris sibi nomen, Græco ejus rei vocabulo, assumpsit. Annal. l. 15. He took to himself the name of Conservator is a *Greek* word which signifies so much: and without question that must be Σωτήρ. However, the first Christians of the *Latine* Church were sometime in doubt what word to use as the constant interpretation of Σωτήρ, so frequent and essential to Christianity. Tertullian useth Saluificator, or, as some books read it, Salvificator: Ergo jam non unus Deus, nec unus Saluificator, si duo salutis artifices, & utique alter altero indigens. De Carne Christi c. 14. and shows it was so translated in the Philippians 3. 20. Et quidem de terra in cælum, ubi nostrum municipium Philippenses quoque ab Apostolo discunt; unde & Saluificatorem nostrum expectamus Jesum Christum. De Resur. Carnis, c. 47. S. Hilary thought Salutaris a sufficient interpretation. Est autem Salutaris ipso illo nomine quo Jesus nuncupatur. Jesus enim secundum Hebraicam linguam Salutaris est. in Psal. 118. S. August. is indifferent between that and Salvator: Deus salvos faciendi Dominus est Jesus, quod interpretatur Salvator, sive Salutaris: and so Laſtant. At last they generally used the word Salvator. First Tertullian, Christus in illo significabatur, taurus ob utramque dispositionem; aliis ferus, ut judex, aliis mansuetus, ut Salvator. adv. Marcion. l. 3. c. 18. which word of his was rather followed by his imitator S. Cyprian, after whom Arnobius used it, after him his disciple Laſtantius: and from thence it continued the constant language of the Church, till the late Innovators thrust it out of the *Latine* Translation.

But whatsoever notion the Heathen had of their Gods or Men which they styled *Saviours*, we know this name belongeth unto *Christ* in a more sublime and peculiar manner. Neither is there *salvation* in any other; for there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved.

It remaineth therefore that we should explain how and for what reasons *Christ* truly is, and properly is call'd, our *Saviour*. First then, I conceive one sufficient cause of that appellation to consist in this, that he hath opened and declared unto us the only true way for the obtaining eternall Salvation, and by such patefaction can deserve no less then the name of *Saviour*. For if those Apostles and Preachers of the Gospel, who received the way of Salvation from him which they delivered unto others, may be said to save those Persons which were converted by their preaching; in a far more eminent and excellent manner must he be said to save them, who first revealed all those truths unto them. S. Paul provoked to emulation them which were his flesh, that he might save some of them; and was made all things to all men, that he might by all means save some. He exhorted Timothy to take heed unto himself, and unto the doctrine, and continue in them; for in doing this, he should both save himself and them that heard him. And S. James speaks in more general terms; Brethren, if any of you do erre from the truth, and one convert him; Let him know, that he which converteth a sinner from the error of his way shall save a soul from death. Now if these are so expressly said to save the Souls of them which are converted by the doctrine which they deliver, with much more reason must *Christ* be said to save them, whose Ministers they are, and in whose name they speak. For it was he which came and preached peace to them which were afar off, and to them that were nigh. The Will of God concerning the Salvation of man was revealed by him. No man hath seen God at any time: the only-begotten Son, which is in the bosome of the Father, he hath declared him. Being then the Gospel of *Christ* is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth, being they which preach it at the command of *Christ* are said to save the Souls of such as believe their word, being it was *Christ* alone who brought life and immortality to light through the gospel; therefore he must in a most eminent and singular manner be acknowledged thereby to save, and consequently must not be denied, even in this first respect, the title of *Saviour*.

L

Secondly,

Secondly, this *Jesus* hath not onely revealed, but also procured, the way of Salvation; not onely delivered it to us, but also wrought it out for us: and so *God sent his Son into the world, that the world through him might be saved.* We were all concluded under sin, and, being the wages of sin is death, we were obliged to eternall punishment, from which it was impossible to be freed, except the sin were first remitted. Now this is the constant rule, that *without shedding of blood is no remission.* * It was therefore necessary that *Christ should appear to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself.* And so he did, for he *shed his blood for many, for the remission of sins,* as himself professeth in the Sacramental institution: he *bare our sins in his own body on the tree,* as *S. Peter* speaks; and so in him *we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins.* And if while we were yet sinners *Christ died for us: much more then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath by him.* Again, we were all enemies unto God, and having offended him, there was no possible way of Salvation, but by being reconciled to him. If then we ask the question, as once the *Philistines* did concerning *David,* *Wherewith should we reconcile our selves unto our Master?* we have no other name to answer it but *Jesus.* For *God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them.* And as under the Law the blood of the sin-offering was brought into the tabernacle of the Congregation to reconcile withall in the holy place; so it pleased the Father through the Son, having made peace by the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself. And thus it comes to pass, that us, who were enemies in our mind by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled in the body of his flesh through death. And upon this reconciliation of our persons must necessarily follow the Salvation of our Souls. For if when we were enemies, we were reconciled unto God by the death of his Son; much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life. Furthermore, we were all at first enslaved by sin, and brought into captivity by Satan, neither was there any possibility of escape but by way of Redemption. Now it was the Law of *Moses,* that if any were able, he might redeem himself: but this to us was impossible, because absolute obedience in all our actions is due unto God, and therefore no act of ours can make any satisfaction for the least offence. Another law gave yet more liberty, that he which was sold might be redeemed again; one of his brethren might redeem him. But this in respect of all the mere sons of men was equally impossible, because they were all under the same captivity. Nor could they satisfy for others, who were wholly unable to redeem themselves. Wherefore there was no other brother, but that Son of man which is the Son of God, who was like unto us in all things, sin onely excepted, which could work this redemption for us. And what he onely could, that he freely did perform. For the Son of man came to give his life a ransom for many: and as he came to give, so he gave himself a ransom for all. * So that in him we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins. For we are bought with a price: for we are redeemed, not with corruptible things, as silver and gold; but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot. He then which hath obtained for us remission of sins, he who through himself hath reconciled us unto God, he who hath given himself as a ransom to redeem us, he who hath thus wrought out the way of Salvation for us, must necessarily have a second and a far higher right unto the name of *Jesus,* unto the title of our Saviour.

Thirdly, beside the promulging and procuring, there is yet a farther act, which is, conferring of Salvation on us. All which we mentioned before was wrought by virtue of his death, and his appearance in the Holy of holies: but we must still believe, he is able also to save them to the uttermost that come

unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them. For now being set down at the right hand of God, he hath received all power both in Heaven and earth; and the end of this power which he hath received is, to confer Salvation upon those which believe in him. For the Father gave the Son *this power over all flesh, that he should give eternall life to as many as he hath given him*; that he should raise our bodies out of the dust, and cause our corruptible to put on incorruption, and our mortal to put on immortality: and upon this power we are to expect Salvation from him. For we must look for the *Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, from heaven, who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself. And unto them that thus look for him shall he appear the second time, without sin, unto salvation.* Being then we are all to endeavour that our spirits may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus; being S. Peter hath taught us, that *God hath exalted Christ with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour*; being the conferring of that upon us which he promised to us, and obtained for us, is the reward of what he suffered; therefore we must acknowledge that the actual giving of Salvation to us is the ultimate and conclusive ground of the title *Saviour*.

Thus by the virtue of his precious blood Christ hath obtained remission of our sins, by the power of his grace hath taken away the dominion of sin, in the life to come will free us from all possibility of sinning, and utterly abolish death the wages of sin: wherefore well said the Angel of the Lord, *Thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins*; well did Zacharias call him *an horn of salvation*; Simeon, *the salvation of God*; S. Paul, *the captain and authour of eternall salvation*; S. Peter, *a Prince and a Saviour*, correspondent to those Judges of Israel, raised up by God himself to deliver his people from the hands of their enemies, and for that reason called *Saviours*. *In the time of their trouble, say the Levites, when they cried unto thee, thou heardest them from heaven, and according to thy manifold mercies thou gavest them Saviours, who saved them out of the hand of their enemies.*

The correspondency of Jesus unto those temporal Saviours will best appear, if we consider it particularly in *Josuah*, who bare that Salvation in his name, and approved it in his actions. For, as the son of Sirach saith, *Jesus the son of Nave was valiant in the wars, and was the successour of Moses in prophecies, who, according to his name, was made great for the saving of the elect of God.* Although therefore *Moses* was truly and really *a ruler and deliverer*, which is the * same with *Saviour*; although the rest of the Judges were also by their office Rulers and Deliverers, and therefore styled *Saviours*, as expressly *Othniel* and *Ehud* are; yet *Josuah*, far more particularly and exactly then the rest, is represented as a Type of our Jesus, and that typicall singularity manifested in his † name. For first, He it was alone, of all which passed out of *Egypt*, who was design'd to lead the children of *Israel* into *Canaan*, the land of promise, flowing with milk and hony. Which land as it was a type of the Heaven of Heavens, the inheritance of the Saints, and eternall joys flowing from the right hand of God; so is the Person which brought the *Israelites* into that place of rest * a Type of him who onely can bring us into the presence of God, and there prepare our mansions for us, and assign them to us, as *Josuah* divided the land for an inheritance to the Tribes. Besides, it is farther observable, not onely what *Josuah* did, but what *Moses* could not doe. The hand of *Moses* and *Aaron* brought them out of *Egypt*, but left them in the Wilderness, and could not seat them in *Canaan*. *Josuah*, the successour, onely could effect that in which *Moses* failed. Now nothing is more frequent in the phrase of the Holy Ghost, then to take *Moses* for the doctrine delivered, or the books

John 17. 2.

Phil. 3. 20.

21.

Heb. 9. 28.

1 Cor. 5. 5.

Acts 5. 31.

Matt. 1. 21.

Luke 1. 69.

Luke 2. 30.

Heb. 5. 9.

Hb. 2. 10.

Acts 5. 35.

Neb. 9. 27.

Eccles. 4. 1.

Acts 7. 35.

Hesych.

Pugns, sa-

tis, autem

ins. and again,

Σωτήρ, ὁ

Ζῆς, ὁ Ἰησοῦς

Χρῆς, ὁ

αὐτοῦ αὐτῆς.

† Quantum

attinet ad

prophetium

apparatum,

nec geri nec

dici aliquid

possit insigni-

us, quan-

doquidem

res perduca-

est usque no-

minis expres-

sionem. S.

Aug. contra

Falsam,

16. 19.

* Ὁν τοῦ

πεν ἐκείνῳ

ἐπὶ τῶν αἰώνων

τῶν αἰώνων

τῶν αἰώνων

τῶν αἰώνων

τῶν αἰώνων

τῶν αἰώνων

τῶν αἰώνων

τῶν αἰώνων

τῶν αἰώνων

τῶν αἰώνων

τῶν αἰώνων

* As Luk. 16. written by him, that is, the * Law; from whence it followeth, that the death of *Moses* and the succession of *Josuah* presignified the continuance of the Law till *Jesus* came, ^a by whom all that believe are justified from all things, from which we could not be justified by the Law of *Moses*. ^b The Law and the Prophets were untill *John*: since that the kingdom of God is preached. *Moses* must die, that *Josuah* may succeed. ^c By the deeds of the Law there shall no flesh be justified, (for by the Law is the knowledge of sin;) but the righteousness of God without the Law is manifested, even the righteousness of God, which is by faith of *Jesus Christ* unto all and upon all them that believe. *Moses* indeed seems to have taken *Josuah* with him up into the † mount: but if he did, sure it was to enter the cloud which covered the Mount where the glory of the Lord abode: for * without *Jesus*, in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge, there is no looking into the secrets of Heaven, no approaching to the presence of God. The command of Circumcision was not given unto *Moses*, but to *Josuah*; nor were the *Israelites* circumcised in the Wilderness, under the conduct of *Moses* and *Aaron*, but in the land of *Canaan*, under their Successour. For ^d at that time the Lord said unto *Josuah*, Make thee sharp knives, and circumcise again the children of *Israel* the second time. Which speaketh † *Jesus* to be the true circumciser, the authour of another circumcision then that of the flesh commanded by the Law, even ^e the circumcision of the heart in the spirit, and not in the letter; that which ^f is made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh, which is therefore called the circumcision of *Christ*.

λαβὲ τὴν βαπτίσαν τῶν ἑσθλῶν. Theodoret. in Jos. Proem. Cum successor Moyfi destinaretur Ausus filius Nave, transfertur certe de pristino nomine, & incipit vocari Jesus. Certe, inquis. Hanc prius dicimus figuram futuri fuisse. Nam quia Jesus Christus secundum populum, quod sumus nos, nationes in seculi deserto commorantes antea, introducturus esset in terram re-promissionis melle & lacte manantem, id est, in vitam æternæ possessionem, qua nihil dulcius, idque non per Moysem, id est, non per Legis disciplinam, sed per Jesum, id est, per novæ Legis gratiam, provenire habebat, circumcisis nobis petrina acie, id est, Christi præceptis, (petra enim Christus multis modis & figuris prædicatus est;) ideo is vir qui in hujus Sacramenti imagine parabatur etiam nominis Dominici inauguratus est figura, ut Jesus nominaretur. Tertul. adv. Judeos, c. 9. & adv. Marcion. l. 3. c. 16. Idcirco Moyfi etiam successit, ut ostenderet novam legem, per Jesum Christum datam, veteri legi successuram, quæ data per Moysem fuit. Lactan. de Vera Sap. l. 4. c. 17. In cujus comparatione (Moyfes) improbatu est, ut non ipse introduceret populum in terram promissionis; ne videlicet Lex per Moysem, non ad salvandum, sed ad convincendum peccatorem, data, in regnum cælorum introducere putaretur, sed gratia & veritas per Jesum Christum facta. S. Aug. contra Faustum, l. 16. c. 19. Jesus dux qui populum eduxerat de Ægypto, Jesus qui interpretatur Salvator, Mose mortuo & sepulto in Moab, hoc est, Lege mortua, in Evangelium cupit inducere populum suum. S. Hieron. in Psal. 86. * Alys 13. 39. * Luke 16. 16. * Rom. 3. 20, 21, 22. † Exod. 24. 13. * Moyfes in nubem intravit, ut opera & occulta cognosceret, adherente sibi socio Jesu, quia nemo sine vero Jesu potest incerta sapientiæ & occulta comprehendere. Et ideo in specie Jesu Nave veri Salvatoris significabatur affutura præsentia, per quem fierent omnes docibiles Dei, qui Legem aperiret, Evangelium revelaret. S. Ambros. in Psal. 47. * Jos. 5. 2. † Non enim propheta sic ait, Et dixit Dominus ad me; sed, ad Jesum: ut ostenderet quod non de se loqueretur, sed de Christo, ad quem tum Deus loquebatur. Christi enim figuram gerebat ille Jesus. Lactan. l. 4. c. 17. * Rom. 2. 29. * Col. 2. 11.

* Err. 24. 13. Thus if we look upon *Josuah* as the ^a minister of *Moses*, he is even in that *Jos. 1. 1.* a type of *Christ*, the ^b minister of the circumcision for the truth of God. If we ^c Rom. 15. 8. look on him as the successor of *Moses*, in that he representeth *Jesus*, inas-
* John 1. 17. much as ^e the Law was given by *Moses*, but grace and truth came by *Jesus Christ*.
* Τὸ ποτὶ τὸν Ἰησοῦν αὐτὸς ὁ θεὸς Ναυὴ Ἰν-
* Jos. 1. 17. σὺς καὶ πα-
* Jos. 1. 17. λαὸς αἰετῶ-
* Jos. 1. 17. ραὶ καὶ ἀν-
* Jos. 1. 17. χρεῖν τὰ λαὸν
* Jos. 1. 17. ἡρέετο ἀπὸ τοῦ
* Jos. 1. 17. τοῦ Ἰορδάνου
* Jos. 1. 17. ὅθεν καὶ ὁ Χρ-
* Jos. 1. 17. στὸς βαπτί-
* Jos. 1. 17. σθεὶς ἡρέετο
* Jos. 1. 17. εὐαγγε-
* Jos. 1. 17. λίσ-
* Jos. 1. 17. θεναι. S. Cyril.
* Jos. 1. 17. Catech. 10.
which is not clearly predictive of our Saviour. He begins his office at the banks of * *Jordan*, where *Christ* is baptized, and enters upon the publick exercise of his propheticall office. He chuseth there twelve men out of the people, to carry twelve stones over with them; as our *Jesus* thence began to chuse his † twelve Apostles, those foundation-stones in the Church of God, whose ^d names are in the twelve foundations of the wall of the holy City, the new *Jerusalem*. It hath been * observed, that the saving *Rahab* the Harlot alive foretold what *Jesus* once should speak to the *Jews*, ^e Verily I say unto you, that

† S. Cyril addeth that he divided the land by twelve men; Δωδεκά τῶν δωδεκά τῶν κληρονομῶν καὶ διέστην ὁ θεὸς Ναυὴ Ἰν-
* Jos. 1. 17. σου Ἀπεστόλους κληρονομίας τῆς ἀληθείας εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην ἀποστέλλει ὁ Ἰησοῦς. Ibid. * Rev. 21. 14. * By the same S. Cyril,
* Jos. 1. 17. Πιστεύσαντες ῥα αὐτὸν τὸν πόρνον ἔκτισεν ὁ τυπικός; ὁ δὲ ἀληθὺς ἔστιν, ἰδὲ οἱ πλῆναι καὶ αἱ πέναντες ἀποστέλλων ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν βασι-
* Jos. 1. 17. λείαν τῆς διῆς. * Matth. 21. 31.

the Publicans and Harlots go into the kingdom of God before you. ^a He said in the sight of Israel, *Sun, stand thou still upon Gibeon: and the sun stood still in the midst of heaven, and hasted not to go down about a whole day.* Which great miracle was not onely wrought by the power of him whose name he bare, but did also * signifie that in the latter days, toward the setting of the Sun, when the light of the world was tending unto a night of darkness, *the Sun of righteousness should arise with healing in his wings,* and, giving a check to the approaching night, become ^b *the true light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world.*

But to pass by more particulars, *Josuah* smote the *Amalekites*, and subdued the *Canaanites*; by the first making way to enter the Land, by the second giving possession of it. And *Jesus* our Prince and Saviour, whose kingdom, was not of this world, in a spiritual manner goeth in and out before us against our spiritual enemies, subduing sin and Satan, and so opening and clearing our way to Heaven; destroying the last enemy, Death, so giving us possession of eternall life. † Thus do we believe the man called *Jesus* to have fulfilled, in the highest degree imaginable, all which was but typified in him who first bare the name, and in all the rest which succeeded in his office, and so to be the Saviour of the world; ^c *whom God hath raised up an horn of salvation for us in the house of his servant David, That we should be saved from our enemies, and the hands of all that hate us.*

divina differret occasum, lucem redderet, invelheret claritatem. S. Ambros. Apolog. David. post. c. 4. Ille imperavit Soli ut staret; & stetit, & istius typo ille magnus erat. Ille imperabar, sed Dominus efficiebar. S. Hier. in Psal. 76. ^a *John* 1. 9. ^b *John* 1. 9. ^c *John* 1. 9. ^d *John* 1. 9. ^e *John* 1. 9. ^f *John* 1. 9. ^g *John* 1. 9. ^h *John* 1. 9. ⁱ *John* 1. 9. ^j *John* 1. 9. ^k *John* 1. 9. ^l *John* 1. 9. ^m *John* 1. 9. ⁿ *John* 1. 9. ^o *John* 1. 9. ^p *John* 1. 9. ^q *John* 1. 9. ^r *John* 1. 9. ^s *John* 1. 9. ^t *John* 1. 9. ^u *John* 1. 9. ^v *John* 1. 9. ^w *John* 1. 9. ^x *John* 1. 9. ^y *John* 1. 9. ^z *John* 1. 9. ^{aa} *John* 1. 9. ^{ab} *John* 1. 9. ^{ac} *John* 1. 9. ^{ad} *John* 1. 9. ^{ae} *John* 1. 9. ^{af} *John* 1. 9. ^{ag} *John* 1. 9. ^{ah} *John* 1. 9. ^{ai} *John* 1. 9. ^{aj} *John* 1. 9. ^{ak} *John* 1. 9. ^{al} *John* 1. 9. ^{am} *John* 1. 9. ^{an} *John* 1. 9. ^{ao} *John* 1. 9. ^{ap} *John* 1. 9. ^{aq} *John* 1. 9. ^{ar} *John* 1. 9. ^{as} *John* 1. 9. ^{at} *John* 1. 9. ^{au} *John* 1. 9. ^{av} *John* 1. 9. ^{aw} *John* 1. 9. ^{ax} *John* 1. 9. ^{ay} *John* 1. 9. ^{az} *John* 1. 9. ^{ba} *John* 1. 9. ^{bb} *John* 1. 9. ^{bc} *John* 1. 9. ^{bd} *John* 1. 9. ^{be} *John* 1. 9. ^{bf} *John* 1. 9. ^{bg} *John* 1. 9. ^{bh} *John* 1. 9. ^{bi} *John* 1. 9. ^{bj} *John* 1. 9. ^{bk} *John* 1. 9. ^{bl} *John* 1. 9. ^{bm} *John* 1. 9. ^{bn} *John* 1. 9. ^{bo} *John* 1. 9. ^{bp} *John* 1. 9. ^{bq} *John* 1. 9. ^{br} *John* 1. 9. ^{bs} *John* 1. 9. ^{bt} *John* 1. 9. ^{bu} *John* 1. 9. ^{bv} *John* 1. 9. ^{bw} *John* 1. 9. ^{bx} *John* 1. 9. ^{by} *John* 1. 9. ^{bz} *John* 1. 9. ^{ca} *John* 1. 9. ^{cb} *John* 1. 9. ^{cc} *John* 1. 9. ^{cd} *John* 1. 9. ^{ce} *John* 1. 9. ^{cf} *John* 1. 9. ^{cg} *John* 1. 9. ^{ch} *John* 1. 9. ^{ci} *John* 1. 9. ^{cj} *John* 1. 9. ^{ck} *John* 1. 9. ^{cl} *John* 1. 9. ^{cm} *John* 1. 9. ^{cn} *John* 1. 9. ^{co} *John* 1. 9. ^{cp} *John* 1. 9. ^{cq} *John* 1. 9. ^{cr} *John* 1. 9. ^{cs} *John* 1. 9. ^{ct} *John* 1. 9. ^{cu} *John* 1. 9. ^{cv} *John* 1. 9. ^{cw} *John* 1. 9. ^{cx} *John* 1. 9. ^{cy} *John* 1. 9. ^{cz} *John* 1. 9. ^{da} *John* 1. 9. ^{db} *John* 1. 9. ^{dc} *John* 1. 9. ^{dd} *John* 1. 9. ^{de} *John* 1. 9. ^{df} *John* 1. 9. ^{dg} *John* 1. 9. ^{dh} *John* 1. 9. ^{di} *John* 1. 9. ^{dj} *John* 1. 9. ^{dk} *John* 1. 9. ^{dl} *John* 1. 9. ^{dm} *John* 1. 9. ^{dn} *John* 1. 9. ^{do} *John* 1. 9. ^{dp} *John* 1. 9. ^{dq} *John* 1. 9. ^{dr} *John* 1. 9. ^{ds} *John* 1. 9. ^{dt} *John* 1. 9. ^{du} *John* 1. 9. ^{dv} *John* 1. 9. ^{dw} *John* 1. 9. ^{dx} *John* 1. 9. ^{dy} *John* 1. 9. ^{dz} *John* 1. 9. ^{ea} *John* 1. 9. ^{eb} *John* 1. 9. ^{ec} *John* 1. 9. ^{ed} *John* 1. 9. ^{ee} *John* 1. 9. ^{ef} *John* 1. 9. ^{eg} *John* 1. 9. ^{eh} *John* 1. 9. ^{ei} *John* 1. 9. ^{ej} *John* 1. 9. ^{ek} *John* 1. 9. ^{el} *John* 1. 9. ^{em} *John* 1. 9. ^{en} *John* 1. 9. ^{eo} *John* 1. 9. ^{ep} *John* 1. 9. ^{eq} *John* 1. 9. ^{er} *John* 1. 9. ^{es} *John* 1. 9. ^{et} *John* 1. 9. ^{eu} *John* 1. 9. ^{ev} *John* 1. 9. ^{ew} *John* 1. 9. ^{ex} *John* 1. 9. ^{ey} *John* 1. 9. ^{ez} *John* 1. 9. ^{fa} *John* 1. 9. ^{fb} *John* 1. 9. ^{fc} *John* 1. 9. ^{fd} *John* 1. 9. ^{fe} *John* 1. 9. ^{ff} *John* 1. 9. ^{fg} *John* 1. 9. ^{fh} *John* 1. 9. ^{fi} *John* 1. 9. ^{fj} *John* 1. 9. ^{fk} *John* 1. 9. ^{fl} *John* 1. 9. ^{fm} *John* 1. 9. ^{fn} *John* 1. 9. ^{fo} *John* 1. 9. ^{fp} *John* 1. 9. ^{fq} *John* 1. 9. ^{fr} *John* 1. 9. ^{fs} *John* 1. 9. ^{ft} *John* 1. 9. ^{fu} *John* 1. 9. ^{fv} *John* 1. 9. ^{fw} *John* 1. 9. ^{fx} *John* 1. 9. ^{fy} *John* 1. 9. ^{fz} *John* 1. 9. ^{ga} *John* 1. 9. ^{gb} *John* 1. 9. ^{gc} *John* 1. 9. ^{gd} *John* 1. 9. ^{ge} *John* 1. 9. ^{gf} *John* 1. 9. ^{gg} *John* 1. 9. ^{gh} *John* 1. 9. ^{gi} *John* 1. 9. ^{gj} *John* 1. 9. ^{gk} *John* 1. 9. ^{gl} *John* 1. 9. ^{gm} *John* 1. 9. ^{gn} *John* 1. 9. ^{go} *John* 1. 9. ^{gp} *John* 1. 9. ^{gq} *John* 1. 9. ^{gr} *John* 1. 9. ^{gs} *John* 1. 9. ^{gt} *John* 1. 9. ^{gu} *John* 1. 9. ^{gv} *John* 1. 9. ^{gw} *John* 1. 9. ^{gx} *John* 1. 9. ^{gy} *John* 1. 9. ^{gz} *John* 1. 9. ^{ha} *John* 1. 9. ^{hb} *John* 1. 9. ^{hc} *John* 1. 9. ^{hd} *John* 1. 9. ^{he} *John* 1. 9. ^{hf} *John* 1. 9. ^{hg} *John* 1. 9. ^{hh} *John* 1. 9. ^{hi} *John* 1. 9. ^{hj} *John* 1. 9. ^{hk} *John* 1. 9. ^{hl} *John* 1. 9. ^{hm} *John* 1. 9. ^{hn} *John* 1. 9. ^{ho} *John* 1. 9. ^{hp} *John* 1. 9. ^{hq} *John* 1. 9. ^{hr} *John* 1. 9. ^{hs} *John* 1. 9. ^{ht} *John* 1. 9. ^{hu} *John* 1. 9. ^{hv} *John* 1. 9. ^{hw} *John* 1. 9. ^{hx} *John* 1. 9. ^{hy} *John* 1. 9. ^{hz} *John* 1. 9. ^{ia} *John* 1. 9. ^{ib} *John* 1. 9. ^{ic} *John* 1. 9. ^{id} *John* 1. 9. ^{ie} *John* 1. 9. ^{if} *John* 1. 9. ^{ig} *John* 1. 9. ^{ih} *John* 1. 9. ⁱⁱ *John* 1. 9. ^{ij} *John* 1. 9. ^{ik} *John* 1. 9. ^{il} *John* 1. 9. ^{im} *John* 1. 9. ⁱⁿ *John* 1. 9. ^{io} *John* 1. 9. ^{ip} *John* 1. 9. ^{iq} *John* 1. 9. ^{ir} *John* 1. 9. ^{is} *John* 1. 9. ^{it} *John* 1. 9. ^{iu} *John* 1. 9. ^{iv} *John* 1. 9. ^{iw} *John* 1. 9. ^{ix} *John* 1. 9. ^{iy} *John* 1. 9. ^{iz} *John* 1. 9. ^{ja} *John* 1. 9. ^{jb} *John* 1. 9. ^{jc} *John* 1. 9. ^{jd} *John* 1. 9. ^{je} *John* 1. 9. ^{jf} *John* 1. 9. ^{jj} *John* 1. 9. ^{jk} *John* 1. 9. ^{jl} *John* 1. 9. ^{jm} *John* 1. 9. ^{jn} *John* 1. 9. ^{jo} *John* 1. 9. ^{jp} *John* 1. 9. ^{jq} *John* 1. 9. ^{jr} *John* 1. 9. ^{js} *John* 1. 9. ^{jt} *John* 1. 9. ^{ju} *John* 1. 9. ^{jv} *John* 1. 9. ^{jw} *John* 1. 9. ^{jx} *John* 1. 9. ^{jy} *John* 1. 9. ^{jz} *John* 1. 9. ^{ka} *John* 1. 9. ^{kb} *John* 1. 9. ^{kc} *John* 1. 9. ^{kd} *John* 1. 9. ^{ke} *John* 1. 9. ^{kf} *John* 1. 9. ^{kg} *John* 1. 9. ^{kh} *John* 1. 9. ^{ki} *John* 1. 9. ^{kj} *John* 1. 9. ^{kl} *John* 1. 9. ^{km} *John* 1. 9. ^{kn} *John* 1. 9. ^{ko} *John* 1. 9. ^{kp} *John* 1. 9. ^{kq} *John* 1. 9. ^{kr} *John* 1. 9. ^{ks} *John* 1. 9. ^{kt} *John* 1. 9. ^{ku} *John* 1. 9. ^{kv} *John* 1. 9. ^{kx} *John* 1. 9. ^{ky} *John* 1. 9. ^{kz} *John* 1. 9. ^{la} *John* 1. 9. ^{lb} *John* 1. 9. ^{lc} *John* 1. 9. ^{ld} *John* 1. 9. ^{le} *John* 1. 9. ^{lf} *John* 1. 9. ^{lg} *John* 1. 9. ^{lh} *John* 1. 9. ^{li} *John* 1. 9. ^{lj} *John* 1. 9. ^{lk} *John* 1. 9. ^{ll} *John* 1. 9. ^{lm} *John* 1. 9. ^{ln} *John* 1. 9. ^{lo} *John* 1. 9. ^{lp} *John* 1. 9. ^{lq} *John* 1. 9. ^{lr} *John* 1. 9. ^{ls} *John* 1. 9. ^{lt} *John* 1. 9. ^{lu} *John* 1. 9. ^{lv} *John* 1. 9. ^{lw} *John* 1. 9. ^{lx} *John* 1. 9. ^{ly} *John* 1. 9. ^{lz} *John* 1. 9. ^{ma} *John* 1. 9. ^{mb} *John* 1. 9. ^{mc} *John* 1. 9. ^{md} *John* 1. 9. ^{me} *John* 1. 9. ^{mf} *John* 1. 9. ^{mg} *John* 1. 9. ^{mh} *John* 1. 9. ^{mi} *John* 1. 9. ^{mj} *John* 1. 9. ^{mk} *John* 1. 9. ^{ml} *John* 1. 9. ^{mm} *John* 1. 9. ^{mn} *John* 1. 9. ^{mo} *John* 1. 9. ^{mp} *John* 1. 9. ^{mq} *John* 1. 9. ^{mr} *John* 1. 9. ^{ms} *John* 1. 9. ^{mt} *John* 1. 9. ^{mu} *John* 1. 9. ^{mv} *John* 1. 9. ^{mw} *John* 1. 9. ^{mx} *John* 1. 9. ^{my} *John* 1. 9. ^{mz} *John* 1. 9. ^{na} *John* 1. 9. ^{nb} *John* 1. 9. ^{nc} *John* 1. 9. nd *John* 1. 9. ^{ne} *John* 1. 9. ^{nf} *John* 1. 9. ^{ng} *John* 1. 9. ^{nh} *John* 1. 9. ⁿⁱ *John* 1. 9. ^{nj} *John* 1. 9. ^{nk} *John* 1. 9. ^{nl} *John* 1. 9. ^{nm} *John* 1. 9. ⁿⁿ *John* 1. 9. ^{no} *John* 1. 9. ^{np} *John* 1. 9. ^{nq} *John* 1. 9. ^{nr} *John* 1. 9. ^{ns} *John* 1. 9. ^{nt} *John* 1. 9. ^{nu} *John* 1. 9. ^{nv} *John* 1. 9. ^{nw} *John* 1. 9. ^{nx} *John* 1. 9. ^{ny} *John* 1. 9. ^{nz} *John* 1. 9. ^{oa} *John* 1. 9. ^{ob} *John* 1. 9. ^{oc} *John* 1. 9. ^{od} *John* 1. 9. ^{oe} *John* 1. 9. ^{of} *John* 1. 9. ^{og} *John* 1. 9. ^{oh} *John* 1. 9. ^{oi} *John* 1. 9. ^{oj} *John* 1. 9. ^{ok} *John* 1. 9. ^{ol} *John* 1. 9. ^{om} *John* 1. 9. ^{on} *John* 1. 9. ^{oo} *John* 1. 9. ^{op} *John* 1. 9. ^{oq} *John* 1. 9. ^{or} *John* 1. 9. ^{os} *John* 1. 9. ^{ot} *John* 1. 9. ^{ou} *John* 1. 9. ^{ov} *John* 1. 9. ^{ow} *John* 1. 9. ^{ox} *John* 1. 9. ^{oy} *John* 1. 9. ^{oz} *John* 1. 9. ^{pa} *John* 1. 9. ^{pb} *John* 1. 9. ^{pc} *John* 1. 9. ^{pd} *John* 1. 9. ^{pe} *John* 1. 9. ^{pf} *John* 1. 9. ^{pg} *John* 1. 9. ^{ph} *John* 1. 9. ^{pi} *John* 1. 9. ^{pj} *John* 1. 9. ^{pk} *John* 1. 9. ^{pl} *John* 1. 9. ^{pm} *John* 1. 9. ^{pn} *John* 1. 9. ^{po} *John* 1. 9. ^{pp} *John* 1. 9. ^{pq} *John* 1. 9. ^{pr} *John* 1. 9. ^{ps} *John* 1. 9. ^{pt} *John* 1. 9. ^{pu} *John* 1. 9. ^{pv} *John* 1. 9. ^{pw} *John* 1. 9. ^{px} *John* 1. 9. ^{py} *John* 1. 9. ^{pz} *John* 1. 9. ^{qa} *John* 1. 9. ^{qb} *John* 1. 9. ^{qc} *John* 1. 9. ^{qd} *John* 1. 9. ^{qe} *John* 1. 9. ^{qf} *John* 1. 9. ^{qg} *John* 1. 9. ^{qh} *John* 1. 9. ^{qi} *John* 1. 9. ^{qj} *John* 1. 9. ^{qk} *John* 1. 9. ^{ql} *John* 1. 9. ^{qm} *John* 1. 9. ^{qn} *John* 1. 9. ^{qo} *John* 1. 9. ^{qp} *John* 1. 9. ^{qq} *John* 1. 9. ^{qr} *John* 1. 9. ^{qs} *John* 1. 9. ^{qt} *John* 1. 9. ^{qu} *John* 1. 9. ^{qv} *John* 1. 9. ^{qw} *John* 1. 9. ^{qx} *John* 1. 9. ^{qy} *John* 1. 9. ^{qz} *John* 1. 9. ^{ra} *John* 1. 9. ^{rb} *John* 1. 9. ^{rc} *John* 1. 9. rd *John* 1. 9. ^{re} *John* 1. 9. ^{rf} *John* 1. 9. ^{rg} *John* 1. 9. ^{rh} *John* 1. 9. ^{ri} *John* 1. 9. ^{rj} *John* 1. 9. ^{rk} *John* 1. 9. ^{rl} *John* 1. 9. ^{rm} *John* 1. 9. ^{rn} *John* 1. 9. ^{ro} *John* 1. 9. ^{rp} *John* 1. 9. ^{rq} *John* 1. 9. ^{rr} *John* 1. 9. ^{rs} *John* 1. 9. ^{rt} *John* 1. 9. ^{ru} *John* 1. 9. ^{rv} *John* 1. 9. ^{rw} *John* 1. 9. ^{rx} *John* 1. 9. ^{ry} *John* 1. 9. ^{rz} *John* 1. 9. ^{sa} *John* 1. 9. ^{sb} *John* 1. 9. ^{sc} *John* 1. 9. ^{sd} *John* 1. 9. ^{se} *John* 1. 9. ^{sf} *John* 1. 9. ^{sg} *John* 1. 9. ^{sh} *John* 1. 9. ^{si} *John* 1. 9. ^{sj} *John* 1. 9. ^{sk} *John* 1. 9. ^{sl} *John* 1. 9. sm *John* 1. 9. ^{sn} *John* 1. 9. ^{so} *John* 1. 9. ^{sp} *John* 1. 9. ^{sq} *John* 1. 9. ^{sr} *John* 1. 9. ^{ss} *John* 1. 9. st *John* 1. 9. ^{su} *John* 1. 9. ^{sv} *John* 1. 9. ^{sw} *John* 1. 9. ^{sx} *John* 1. 9. ^{sy} *John* 1. 9. ^{sz} *John* 1. 9. ^{ta} *John* 1. 9. ^{tb} *John* 1. 9. ^{tc} *John* 1. 9. ^{td} *John* 1. 9. ^{te} *John* 1. 9. ^{tf} *John* 1. 9. ^{tg} *John* 1. 9. th *John* 1. 9. ^{ti} *John* 1. 9. ^{tj} *John* 1. 9. ^{tk} *John* 1. 9. ^{tl} *John* 1. 9. tm *John* 1. 9. ^{tn} *John* 1. 9. ^{to} *John* 1. 9. ^{tp} *John* 1. 9. ^{tq} *John* 1. 9. ^{tr} *John* 1. 9. ^{ts} *John* 1. 9. ^{tt} *John* 1. 9. ^{tu} *John* 1. 9. ^{tv} *John* 1. 9. ^{tw} *John* 1. 9. ^{tx} *John* 1. 9. ^{ty} *John* 1. 9. ^{tz} *John* 1. 9. ^{ua} *John* 1. 9. ^{ub} *John* 1. 9. ^{uc} *John* 1. 9. ^{ud} *John* 1. 9. ^{ue} *John* 1. 9. ^{uf} *John* 1. 9. ^{ug} *John* 1. 9. ^{uh} *John* 1. 9. ^{ui} *John* 1. 9. ^{uj} *John* 1. 9. ^{uk} *John* 1. 9. ^{ul} *John* 1. 9. ^{um} *John* 1. 9. ^{un} *John* 1. 9. ^{uo} *John* 1. 9. ^{up} *John* 1. 9. ^{uq} *John* 1. 9. ^{ur} *John* 1. 9. ^{us} *John* 1. 9. ^{ut} *John* 1. 9. ^{uu} *John* 1. 9. ^{uv} *John* 1. 9. ^{uw} *John* 1. 9. ^{ux} *John* 1. 9. ^{uy} *John* 1. 9. ^{uz} *John* 1. 9. ^{va} *John* 1. 9. ^{vb} *John* 1. 9. ^{vc} *John* 1. 9. ^{vd} *John* 1. 9. ^{ve} *John* 1. 9. ^{vf} *John* 1. 9. ^{vg} *John* 1. 9. ^{vh} *John* 1. 9. ^{vi} *John* 1. 9. ^{vj} *John* 1. 9. ^{vk} *John* 1. 9. ^{vl} *John* 1. 9. ^{vm} *John* 1. 9. ^{vn} *John* 1. 9. ^{vo} *John* 1. 9. ^{vp} *John* 1. 9. ^{vq} *John* 1. 9. ^{vr} *John* 1. 9. ^{vs} *John* 1. 9

* As Luk. 16.

29, 31.

and 24. 27.

Joh. 5. 45.

46.

Acts 6. 11.

collated with

the 13. verse.

Acts 15. 21.

and 21. 21.

2 Cor. 3. 15.

Μωϋσῆς νο-

τίον τὸν νό-

μον, Ἰησοῦν

τὸν ὁμῶνυ-

μον ἐκείνῳ

συντίθεσθαι.

ὡς

πρὶν

ἢ τὸν Ἰσρα-

ῆλ, Μωϋσῆ

τὴν ἐυτυχί-

α, Ἰησοῦς

τὸν λαὸν εἰς

τὴν ἐμπρο-

μήνῳ εἰσ-

αγωγῇ γυν-

ῆται μὲν τὸ

νόμον τὸν

ὁ ἡμέτερος

ὁμοιωθεὶς Ἰη-

σοῦ ἀνέφε-

ρὰν εὐσπε-

ρὰν τὸν βασι-

λέαν Ἰησοῦν.

Theodoret. in Jos. Proem.

Cum successor Moyſi destinaretur Auses filius Nave, transfertur

certe de pristino nomine, & incipit vocari Jesus. Certe, inquis. Hanc prius dicimus figuram futuri fuisse. Nam quia Jesus

Christus secundum populum, quod sumus nos, nationes in seculi deserto commorantes antea, introducturus esset in terram re-

promissionis melle & lacte manantem, id est, in vite eternæ possessionem, qua nihil dulcius, idque non per Moyſen, id est, non

per Legis disciplinam, sed per Jesum, id est, per novæ Legis gratiam, provenire habebat, circumcisis nobis petrina acie, id est,

Christi præceptis, (petra enim Christus multis modis & figuris prædicatus est,) ideo is vir qui in hujus Sacramenti imagine pa-

rabatur etiam nominis Domini inauguratus est figura, ut Jesus nominaretur. Tertul. adv. Judeos, c. 9. & adv. Marcion. l. 3.

e. 16. Idcirco Moyſi etiam successit, ut ostenderet novam legem, per Jesum Christum datam, veteri legi successuram, quæ data

per Moyſen fuit. Lactan. de Vera Sap. l. 4. c. 17. In cujus comparatione (Moyſes) improbatus est, ut non ipse introduceret popu-

lum in terram promissionis; ne videlicet Lex per Moyſen, non ad salvandum, sed ad convincendum peccatorem, data, in regnum

cælorum introducere putaretur, sed gratia & veritas per Jesum Christum facta. S. Aug. contra Faustum, l. 16. c. 19. Jesus dux

qui populum eduxerat de Aegypto, Jesus qui interpretatur Salvator, Mose mortuo & sepulto in Moab, hoc est, Lege mortua, in

Evangelium cupit inducere populum suum. S. Hieron. in Psal. 86. a Acts 13. 39. b Luke 16. 16. c Rom. 3. 20, 21, 22.

† Exod. 24. 13. * Moyſes in nubem intravit, ut opera & occulta cognosceret, adherente sibi socio Jesu, quia nemo sine vero

Jesu potest incerta sapientiæ & occulta comprehendere. Et ideo in specie Jesu Nave veri Salvatoris significabatur astutia præ-

sentia, per quem fierent omnes docibiles Dei, qui Legem aperiret, Evangelium revelaret. S. Ambros. in Psal. 47. d Jos. 5. 2.

† Non enim propheta sic ait, Et dixit Dominus ad me; sed, ad Jesum: ut ostenderet quod non de se loqueretur, sed de Christo,

ad quem tum Deus loquebatur. Christi enim figuram gerebat ille Jesus. Lactan. l. 4. c. 17. e Rom. 2. 29. f Col. 2. 11.

g Ex. 24. 13.

Jos. 1. 1.

h Rom. 15. 8.

i John 1. 17.

* Τύπος ὁ

ἔργον αὐτοῦ ὁ

ἐν Νάων Ἰη-

σοῦς καὶ παλ-

αῖ. ἀρξά-

μεν ὁ δὲ ἀ-

ρχὴν οὗ λαοῦ

ἠρξάτο ἀπὸ

ἐν Ἰερουσα-

λὲν, ὁ Χρι-

στὸς ἐκτί-

θεὶς ἠρξάτο

ἐκτιθεῖν τὰς

ἐκτὸς τῆς

ἐκτὸς τῆς

ἐκτὸς τῆς

ἐκτὸς τῆς

ἐκτὸς τῆς

ἐκτὸς τῆς

ἐκτὸς τῆς

ἐκτὸς τῆς

ἐκτὸς τῆς

ἐκτὸς τῆς

written by him, that is, the * Law; from whence it followeth, that the death of Moses and the succession of Josuah presignified the continuance of the Law till Jesus came, ^a by whom all that believe are justified from all things, from which we could not be justified by the Law of Moses. ^b The Law and the Prophets were untill John: since that the kingdom of God is preached. Moses must die, that Josuah may succeed. ^c By the deeds of the Law there shall no flesh be justified, (for by the Law is the knowledge of sin;) but the righteousness of God without the Law is manifested, even the righteousness of God, which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe. Moses indeed seems to have taken Josuah with him up into the † mount: but if he did, sure it was to enter the cloud which covered the Mount where the glory of the Lord abode: for * without Jesus, in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge, there is no looking into the secrets of Heaven, no approaching to the presence of God. The command of Circumcision was not given unto Moses, but to Josuah; nor were the Israelites circumcised in the Wilderness, under the conduct of Moses and Aaron, but in the land of Canaan, under their Successour. For ^d at that time the Lord said unto Josuah, Make thee sharp knives, and circumcise again the children of Israel the second time. Which speaketh † Jesus to be the true circumciser, the authour of another circumcision then that of the flesh commanded by the Law, even ^e the circumcision of the heart in the spirit, and not in the letter; that which ^f is made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh, which is therefore called the circumcision of Christ.

g Ex. 24. 13.

Jos. 1. 1.

h Rom. 15. 8.

i John 1. 17.

* Τύπος ὁ

ἔργον αὐτοῦ ὁ

ἐν Νάων Ἰη-

σοῦς καὶ παλ-

αῖ. ἀρξά-

μεν ὁ δὲ ἀ-

ρχὴν οὗ λαοῦ

ἠρξάτο ἀπὸ

ἐν Ἰερουσα-

λὲν, ὁ Χρι-

στὸς ἐκτί-

θεὶς ἠρξάτο

ἐκτιθεῖν τὰς

ἐκτὸς τῆς

ἐκτὸς τῆς

ἐκτὸς τῆς

ἐκτὸς τῆς

ἐκτὸς τῆς

ἐκτὸς τῆς

ἐκτὸς τῆς

ἐκτὸς τῆς

ἐκτὸς τῆς

ἐκτὸς τῆς

ἐκτὸς τῆς

ἐκτὸς τῆς

ἐκτὸς τῆς

ἐκτὸς τῆς

ἐκτὸς τῆς

ἐκτὸς τῆς

ἐκτὸς τῆς

Thus if we look upon Josuah as the ^a minister of Moses, he is even in that a type of Christ, the ^b minister of the circumcision for the truth of God. If we look on him as the successor of Moses, in that he representeth Jesus, inas- much as ^c the Law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ. If we look on him as now Judge and Ruler of Israel, there is scarce an action which is not clearly predictive of our Saviour. He begins his office at the banks of * Jordan, where Christ is baptized, and enters upon the publick exercise of his propheticall office. He chuseth there twelve men out of the people, to carry twelve stones over with them; as our Jesus thence began to chuse his † twelve Apostles, those foundation-stones in the Church of God, whose ^d names are in the twelve foundations of the wall of the holy City, the new Jerusalem. It hath been * observed, that the saving Rahab the Harlot alive foretold what Jesus once should speak to the Jews, ^e Verily I say unto you, that

† S. Cyril addeth that he divided the land by twelve men; Δωδεκά δὲ διαμερίσας τὸν λαὸν ἐνομίαν καὶ δέσπονον ὁ ἐν Νάων Ἰησοῦς, καὶ δίδωκε τὰς Ἀπὸστολὰς κληρικούς τῆς ἀληθείας εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν οὐκ ἐκείνην ἀποστείλει ὁ Ἰησοῦς. Ibid. * Rev. 21. 14. * By the same S. Cyril, Πιστεύουσιν. Ραὰβ τὴν πόρνην ἔρωσιν ὁ τυπικός· ὁ δὲ ἀληθὺς ἔρωσιν, ἰδὲ οἱ πλῆναι, αἱ πύργου ἀπεδείχθησαν ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ. * Matth. 21. 31.

the

the Publicans and Harlots go into the kingdom of God before you. ^a He said in the sight of Israel, *Sun, stand thou still upon Gibeon: and the sun stood still in the midst of heaven, and hasted not to go down about a whole day.* Which great miracle was not onely wrought by the power of him whose name he bare, but did also * signifie that in the latter days, toward the setting of the Sun, when the light of the world was tending unto a night of darkness, *the Sun of righteousness should arise with healing in his wings*, and, giving a check to the approaching night, become ^b *the true light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world.*

But to pass by more particulars, *Josuah* smote the *Amalekites*, and subdued the *Canaanites*; by the first making way to enter the Land, by the second giving possession of it. And *Jesus* our Prince and Saviour, whose kingdom was not of this world, in a spiritual manner goeth in and out before us against our spiritual enemies, subduing sin and Satan, and so opening and clearing our way to Heaven; destroying the last enemy, Death, so giving us possession of eternall life. † Thus do we believe the man called *Jesus* to have fulfilled, in the highest degree imaginable, all which was but typified in him who first bare the name, and in all the rest which succeeded in his office, and so to be the Saviour of the world; ^c *whom God hath raised up an horn of salvation for us in the house of his servant David, That we should be saved from our enemies, and the hands of all that hate us.*

divina differret occasum, lucem redderet, invehret claritatem. S. Ambros. Apolog. David. post. c. 4. Ille imperavit Soli ut staret; & stetit, & istius typo ille magnus erat. Ille imperabat, sed Dominus efficiebat. S. Hier. in Psal. 76. ^b John 1. 9. † Τι λέγει πάλιν Μωσής πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν πρὸς τὴν Ναυὴν ὑμῶν, ἐπιθεὶς αὐτῷ τὸ ὄνομα ὡς πρὸς τὴν ἰσχυρίαν; ἵνα μόνον ἀκούσῃ πᾶς λαὸς, ὅτι πάντες ὁ πατήρ φωνεῖται πρὸς τὸν υἱόν. Ἰησοῦς ὑμῶν Νάων; καὶ ἐπιθεὶς τὸ ὄνομα ὡς πρὸς τὴν ἰσχυρίαν κατέσκαπεν τὴν γῆν. λέγει βίβλος εἰς τὴν χειρὸς σου, καὶ γέφυρα αὐτὸς λέγει Κόρυθος. ὅτι ἐν ῥίζαν ἐκκόψει πάντας τὸν οἶκον τῶν Ἀμαληκίτων ὅς ἐστις τὸ δὲ ἐπ' ἐχάστων τῶν ἡμερῶν. Οἱ δὲ (16. 18) πάλιν Ἰησοῦς ἔχ' ὁ υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου, ἀλλ' ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, τίς ποτε ἔν' Ἰσραὴλ φωνεῖται. Barnabas Epist. c. 9. ^c Luke 1. 69, 71.

The necessity of the belief of this part of the Article is not onely certain, but evident: because there is no end of Faith without a Saviour, and no other name but this by which we can be saved, and no way to be saved by him but by believing in him. For *this is his commandment, that we should believe on the name of his Son Jesus Christ: and he that keepeth his commandments dwelleth in him, and he in him.* From him then, and from him alone, must we expect Salvation, acknowledging and confessing freely there is nothing in our selves which can effect it or deserve it for us, nothing in any other creature which can promerit or procure it to us. For *there is but one God, and one Mediatour between God and men, the man Christ Jesus.* 'Tis onely the beloved Son, in whom God is well pleased: he is clothed with a vesture dipt in bloud; he hath trod the wine-press alone. *We like sheep have gone astray, and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all.* By him God hath reconciled all things to himself, by him, I say, whether they be things in earth or things in heaven. By him alone is our Salvation wrought: for his sake then onely can we ask it, from him alone expect it.

Secondly, this Belief is necessary, that we may delight and rejoyce in the name of *Jesus*, as that in which all our happiness is involv'd. At his nativity an Angel from Heaven thus taught the Shepherds, the first witnesses of the blessed Incarnation; *Behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people. For unto you is born this day, in the City of David, a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord.* And what the Angel delivered at present, that the Prophet *Isaiab*, that old Evangelist, foretold at distance. When the people which walked in darkness should see a great light; when unto us a child should be born, unto us a son should be given; then should they joy before God, according to the joy of harvest, and as men rejoyce when they divide the spoil. When God shall come

with recompense, when he shall come and save us; then the ransomed of the Lord shall return, and come to Sion with songs, and everlasting joy upon their heads.

Thirdly, the belief in *Jesus* ought to inflame our affection, to kindle our love toward him, engaging us to hate all things in respect of him, that is, so far as they are in opposition to him, or pretend to equal share of affection with him. *He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me, and he that loveth son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me*, saith our Saviour; so forbidding all prelation of any natural affection, because our spiritual union is far beyond all such relations. Nor is a higher degree of love onely debarr'd us, but any equal pretension is as much forbidden. *If any man come to me*, saith the same *Christ*, *and hate not his father and mother, and wife and children, and brethren and sisters, yea and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple*. Is it not this *Jesus* in whom the love of God is demonstrated to us, and that in so high a degree as is not expressible by the pen of man? *God so loved the world, that he gave his onely-begotten Son*. Is it not he who shewed his own love to us far beyond all possibility of parallel? for greater love hath no man then this, that a man lay down his life for his friends: but while we were yet sinners, that is, enemies, *Christ* died for us, and so became our *Jesus*. Shall thus the Father shew his love in his Son? shall thus the Son shew his love in himself? and shall we no way study a requital? or is there any proper return of love but love? The voice of the Church, in the language of *Solomon*, is, *My love*: nor was that onely the expression of a Spouse, but of * *Ignatius*, a man, after the Apostles, most remarkable. And whosoever considereth the infinite benefits to the sons of men flowing from the actions and sufferings of their Saviour, cannot chuse but conclude with *S. Paul*, *If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be Anathema Maran-atha*.

Lastly, the confession of faith in *Jesus* is necessary to breed in us a correspondent esteem of him, and an absolute obedience to him. That we may be raised to the true temper of *S. Paul*, who counted all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of *Christ Jesus* our Lord, for whom he suffered the loss of all things, and counted them but dung, that he might win *Christ*. Nor can we pretend to any true love of *Jesus*, except we be sensible of the readiness of our obedience to him: as knowing what language he used to his Disciples, *If ye love me, keep my commandments*; and what the Apostle of his bosome spake, *This is the love of God, that we keep his commandments*. His own Disciples once marvelled, and said, *What manner of man is this, that even the winds and the sea obey him*? How much more should we wonder at all disobedient Christians, saying, *What manner of men are these, who refuse obedience unto him whom the senseless creatures, the winds and the sea, obeyed*? Was the name of *Jesus* at first sufficient to cast out devils? and shall man be more refractory then they? Shall the *Exorcist* say to the evil spirit, *I adjure thee by the name of Jesus*, and the devil give place? shall an Apostle speak unto us in the same name, and we refuse? Shall they obey that name, which signifieth nothing unto them; for he took not on him the nature of Angels, and so is not their Saviour? and can we deny obedience unto him, who took on him the seed of Abraham, and became obedient to death, even the death of the cross, for us, that he might be raised to full power and absolute dominion over us, and by that power be enabled at last to save us, and in the meantime to rule and govern us, and exact the highest veneration from us? For *God hath highly exalted him, and given him a Name which is above every name, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth*.

Having thus declared the Original of the name *Jesus*, the means and ways by

by which he which bare it expressed fully the utmost signification of it; we may now clearly deliver, and every particular Christian easily understand what it is he says, when he makes his confession in these words, *I believe in Jesus*: which may be not unfitly in this manner described. I believe not onely that there is a God who made the World; but I acknowledge and profess that I am fully persuaded of this, as of a certain and infallible truth, that there was and is a man, whose name by the ministry of an Angel was called *Jesus*, of whom particularly *Josuah*, the first of that name, and all the rest of the Judges and Saviours of *Israel*, were but types. I believe that *Jesus*, in the highest and utmost importance of that name, to be the Saviour of the world; inasmuch as he hath revealed to the sons of men the onely way for the salvation of their Souls, and wrought the same way out for them by the virtue of his blood, obtaining remission for sinners, making reconciliation for enemies, paying the price of redemption for captives; and shall at last himself actually confer the same Salvation, which he hath promulged and procured, upon all those which unfeignedly and stedfastly believe in him. I acknowledge there is no other way to Heaven beside that which he hath shewn us, there is no other means which can procure it for us but his blood, there is no other person which shall confer it on us but himself. And with this full acknowledgement, *I believe in Jesus*.

And in JESUS CHRIST.

HAVING thus explained the proper Name of our Saviour, *Jesus*, we come unto that Title of his Office usually joyned with his Name, which is therefore the more diligently to be examined, because the * *Jews*, who always acknowledged him to be *Jesus*, ever denied him to be *Christ*, and agreed together, ^a *that if any man did confess that he was Christ, he should be put out of the Synagogue*.

* *Ἰουδαῖοι οὐδεὶς λέγων τὸ ἐγώ εἰμι αὐτὸν Ἰησοῦν, τὸ εἶναι Χριστὸν ἐκβαλεῖται ἐκ τῆς συναγωγῆς.* S. Cyril. Catec. 10.
* John 9: 22.

For the full explication of this Title, it will be necessary, first, to deliver the signification of the word; secondly, to shew upon what grounds the *Jews* always expected a *Christ* or *Messias*; thirdly, to prove that the *Messias* promised to the *Jews* is already come; fourthly, to demonstrate that our *Jesus* is that *Messias*; and fifthly, to declare in what that Unction, by which *Jesus* is *Christ*, doth consist, and what are the proper effects thereof. Which five particulars being clearly discussed, I cannot see what should be wanting for a perfect understanding that *Jesus is Christ*.

For the first, we find in the Scriptures two several names, *Messias* and *Christ*, but both of the same signification; as appeareth by the speech of the woman of *Samaria*, *I know that Messias cometh, which is called Christ*; and more plainly by what *Andrew* spake unto his brother *Simon*, *We have found the Messias, which is, being interpreted, the Christ*. *Messias* in the Hebrew tongue, *Christ* in the † *Greek*. * *Messias*, the language of *Andrew* and the woman of *Samaria*, who spake in *Syriack*; *Christ*, the interpretation of *S. John*, who wrote his Gospel in the *Greek*, as the most general language in those days: and the signification of them both is, *the Anointed*. *S. Paul* and the rest of the Apostles, writing in that language, used the *Greek* name, which the *Latines* did retain, calling him constantly *Christus*; and we in *English* have retained the same, as universally naming him *Christ*.

John 4. 25.
John 1. 41.

† *Χριστός*, *Measias* *Co-*
σμον *ἁγιω-*
ς *Θεός* *ἀν-*
θρώπου *Ἰ-*
σχυροῦ *α-*
νάστης *Ε-*
λπίς *πα-*
τρὸς.
Nonnus.
* From

in the Hebrew מָשִׁיחַ and מְשִׁיחַ unctus, in the Syriac מְשִׁיחָא: in the Greek, by changing *W* into *or*, by omitting *τ* a guttural not fit for their pronunciation, and by adding *s* as their ordinary termination, *מְשִׁיחָא* is turned into *Measias*. That this was the Greek *Xristos* and the Latine *Christus*, is evident; and yet the *Latines* living at a distance, strangers to the customs of the *Jews*, and the doctrine of the *Christians*, mistook this name, and called him *Chrestus*, from the Greek *Χρηστος*. So *Suetonius* in the life of *Claudius*, c. 25. *Judæos impulsere Chresto assidue tumultuantes Roma expulsi*. Which was not onely his mistake, but generally the *Romans* at first, as they named him *Chrestus*, so they called us *Chrestiani*. *Tertul. adv. Gentes*. Sed & cum perperam *Chrestianus* pronuncia-

tur

tur à vobis, (nam nec nominis certa est notitia penes vos) de suavitate vel benignitate compositum est. *Lactant. l. 4. c. 17.* Sed exponenda hujus nominis ratio est propter ignorantium errorem, qui cum immutata litera Christum solent dicere. *Upon which mistake Justin Martyr justifies the Christians of his time, Ἐπει δὲ οὐκ ἐν τῷ ἰσχυρῶς ἡμῶν ὀνόματι, χριστοῦ τινι καταγγέλλομεν.* And again, *Χριστὸν* (or rather *Χριστὸν*) ὃν τὸ καταγγέλλομεν, τὸ χριστὸν μαρτυροῦμεν ὡς εἰρηγόν. *Apch. 1.* It was thus the ignorance of the Jewish affairs which caused the Romans to name our Saviour Christus, and the true title is certainly Christus. *Χριστός*, ἔστι τὸ κρυπτόν, saith *Justin*. Τὸ τὸ Χριστὸν ὅραμα ὁμοῦν Μαρία τῆς χριστοῦ ὡς ὁμοῦν, says *Euseb. Dem. Evang. l. 4. c. 15.* Quoniam Græci veteres *χριστὸν* dicebant ungi, quod nunc *ἀλειψάς*, ob hanc rationem nos cum *Χριστῷ* nuncupamus, id est, unctum, qui Hebraice *Messias* dicitur. *Lact. l. 4. c. 7.* So the Latines generally Christus à chrismate: and without question *χριστός* is from *χρίω*. Yet I conceive the first signification of this word among the Greeks hath not been hitherto sufficiently discovered. The first of the Ancients in whom I meet with the word *χριστός* is *Æschylus* the Tragedian, and in him I find it had another sense; then now we take it in; for in his language that is not *χριστός* which is anointed, but that with which it is anointed; so that it signifies not the subject of unction, but the ointment as diffused in the subject. The place is this in his *Prometheus Vinctus*.

Οὐκ ἠὲ ἀλῆσθημ' ἕδιν, ἕδῃ βρώσιμον,
Οὐ χρεῖσιν, ἕδῃ πῖσιν, ἀλλὰ φαρμάκων
Χρεῖα κατεσχέλλοντε. —————

Prometheus shows himself to be the inventor of the art of Physick, that before him therefore there was no medicine, neither to be taken internally by eating or by drinking, nor externally by way of unction, as the Scholiast very well observes it. Οὐκ ἔτι τότε βανδισμα διαφανείας, ἡδὲ διὰ βραχέως αὐτοσχευόμενον, (which is ἡδὲ βραδύμενον in Aeschylus) ἢ τὰ ὅτι ἐμπυρίσματος ἔξωτον, (which is ἡ χερσὶν ἡδὲ διὰ τοῦ ποτός, (ἥτοι ὃ διὰ τοῦ πόνου.) So Eustathius, Τρεῖς φαρμάκων ἱστέον παρ' Ὀμήρῳ. ὀπίπασα, αἰνυῖσι ἐπὶ Μενελάῳ, ὅτε ἡντο φάρμακα εἰδὲς πᾶσιν ἐν Μάχῳ, ἢ χερσὶ, ὅς τις χερσὶ, ἢ παρ' ἑπὶ τὸ Αἰγρόλον, τετσί, ποτὶ ἢ ποτῖμα. Ad II. d'. As therefore from now ποτῖμα, πόνος, so from χερσὶ χερσὶν. And as πόνος is not that which receiveth drink, but that drink which is received, nor ποτὶ ποτῖ, so ποτῖ ποτῖμα; is not that which receiveth oyl, but that which is received by unction. So the Scholiast upon Anisophorou, Τὰ φαρμάκων τὰ μὴ δεῖ χερατῆρας, τὰ ὅ χερσὶ, τὰ ὅ ποτῖ. And the Scholiast of Theocritus, Ἰστέον ὅτι φάρμακων τὰ μὴ εἴσι χερσὶ, ἢ χερσὶ, ἀφ' οὗ χερσὶμα εἰς διαφανείαν τὰ ὅ ποτῖ, ἢ χερσὶ, ἀφ' οὗ ποτῖμα; τὰ ὅ ὀπίπασα, ἢ χερσὶ, ἀφ' οὗ ὀπίπασα. Idyl. 11. So that χερσὶ in his judgement is the same with ἢ χερσὶ in Theocritus.

Οὐδὲν πεπὶν ἑρῶτα πτερυχὴ φάρμακον ἄλλο,
Νικία, ἔτ' ἔγχεισον, ἐμὴν δοκῇ, ἔτ' ὀπίσσω,
ἢ καὶ Πέριπλοισι ———

In the same sense with *Aschyrius* and *Euripides* use $\chi\rho\epsilon\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\nu$ in *Hippolyto*, $\rho\acute{o}\tau\epsilon\rho\alpha\ \delta\ \chi\rho\epsilon\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\nu\ \eta\ \rho\acute{o}\tau\acute{o}\nu\ \tau\acute{o}\nu\ \sigma\alpha\rho\mu\alpha\kappa\acute{o}\nu$; And not only those ancient Poets, but even the later Orators; as *Dion Chrysostomus*: Ποῦδ' ὁ χρεῖς καὶ διαβαρυνθεὶς σώματι καὶ νεύοντι τῷ διαβαρυνθέντι, καὶ αἰετῇ, ὅχι ὑπὸ σαρκίαν χρεῖαν ἢ πτόν. *Orat.* 78. And the LXX have used it in this sense; as when the Hebrew speaks of $\Pi\omega\omega$ $\Pi\omega$ oleum unctiois, they translate it τὸ ἐπιχρησθῆναι ἐπὶ τῷ καρπῷ τοῦ ἁγίου τοῦ χρεῖς, *Levit.* 21. 10. and again *vers.* 12. $\Pi\omega\omega$ $\Pi\omega$ ἐπὶ τὸ ἅγιον ἔλαιον τὸ χρεῖς ἐπ' αὐτῷ. Oleum unctiois then is ἔλαιον χρεῖς, which in *Exodus* 29. 7. and 35. 13. and 40. 9. the same Translators, correspondent to the Hebrew phrase, call ἔλαιον χρεῖς ματὸς, and more frequently ἔλαιον χρεῖς. The place of *Sophocles* is something doubtful. Ὅθεν μάλιν παύσας καὶ πᾶσι παύσας πυγχεῖω συγκεθεῖς ἐπιπρᾶσαι θνῆς, for though the Scholiast take it in the ordinary sense, πυγχεῖω λήπει τὰ πῦρ καὶ ἡν τῷ χερσὶν πῦρ συγκεθεῖς καὶ ἀρμωσθεῖς τὴν πρὸς τὸ θνῆς yet both τὰ πρὸς before it, and συγκεθεῖς after, seem to incline to the former sense, p. 354. and in the next place ἀρτήχου is clearly attributed to the ornament. Τὸ φαρμακον τοῦ ἀρτήχου, αἰετῇ τ' αὖθις θέρμην ἀνέλον ἐμυρεῖς ὧς ἐν ἐμῇ. Ὡς δ' ἀρτήχου ἀρμωσθῆμι πρὸς from whence *Dejanira* says present ἔχουσαν μανθῶ. But though it appear from hence that the first use of the word χρεῖς among the Greeks was to signify the act or matter used in unction, not the subject or person anointed; yet in the vulgar acceptance of the LXX it was most constantly received for the person anointed, of the same validity with χρεῖς τις or κρησθῆναι, (*Suidas*, χρεῖς, ὁ κρησθῆναι ἐν ἔλαιῳ) as also with ἡλεμῆναι. For though *Lactantius* in the place fore-cited seem to think that word an improper version of the Hebrew $\Pi\omega\omega$, unde in quibundam Graecis scripturis, quae male de Hebraicis interpretata sunt, ἡλεμῆναι, id est, unguento curatus, scripum invenitur, ὑπὸ τῷ ἀλείφειν; yet the LXX have so translated it, *Nam.* 3. 3. οἱ ἱερεῖς οἱ ἡλεμῆσθαι. And although *Athenaeus* hath observed, οὐ μὲν τὸν ὡς δὲ χρεῖς ματὸς, τὰ δ' ἀλείμματ' yet in the vulgar use of the words there is no difference, as he himself speaks a little after, Τὸ δ' χρεῖς τῷ πῦρ καὶ ἀλείμματι μυστέος ἔρρηκ. And *Plutarch*, *Sympo.* l. 3. c. 4. Πῦρ περὶ οὗ ἐπὶ *Σωκρατισμοῦ* ὡς ἡν καὶ ἡ μυστὸς ἀλημῆσθαι ἢ ἔλαιον ἀναπύπτανται καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ χρεῖς ματὸς ἐν τῷ συγκεθεῖν. So *Hesych.* Ἀλείφω, ἔλαιον χρεῖς, Κρησθῆναι, ἡλεμῆναι. Ἀλοιφῇ, χρεῖς. *Schol. Rom.* Χερσθῆναι, ἀλεμῆναι. Ὅδ' εἰ. And *Suidas*, ἡλεμῆναι, ἐχεῖναι. Hence *Eusebiius*, Ἰστοῦ καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς ὡσαυμένων καὶ ἡν ὡς πρὸς πρὸς πρὸς, καὶ τὸ ἀλείφω τὸ ὡς χρεῖς περὶ τὸν χρεῖς ἐπὶ τοῖς χρεῖς, τὸ δ' ἀλείφω περὶ τὸ ἄλλω. Ὅδ' εἰ. So *Eusebiius*, Τεῖν τῷ χρεῖς αὐτὸν χρεῖς ἐν ἔλαιῳ, τὸ εἶ ὡς ὡς ὡς, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀλλοῖς ὡς ὡς ὡς. *Hist. Eccl.* l. 1. c. 3. Χρεῖς then in the vulgar sense of the LXX is a person anointed, and in that sense is our Saviour called *Christ*.

Nor is this yet the full interpretation of the word, which is to be understood not simply according to the action only, but as it involveth the design in the custome of anointing. For in the Law whatsoever was anointed was thereby set apart, as ordained to some special use or office : and therefore under the notion of unction we must understand that promotion and ordination. *Jacob poured oyl on the top of a pillar*, and that anointing was the consecration of it. *Moses* anointed the Tabernacle and all the Vessels, and this anointing was their dedication. Hence *the Priest that is anointed* signifieth, in the phrase of *Moses*, the High Priest, because he was invested in that office at and by his unction. When therefore *Jesus* is called the *Messias* or *Christ*, and that so long after the anointing oyl had ceased, it signified no less then a Person set apart by God, anointed with most sacred oyl, advanced to the highest office, of which all those employments under the Law, in the obtaining of which oyl was used, were but types and shadows. And this may suffice for the signification of the word.

That

That there was among the *Jews* an expectation of such a *Christ* to come, is most evident. The woman of *Samaria* could speak with confidence, *I know* John 4. 25. *that Messias cometh.* And the unbelieving *Jews*, who will not acknowledge that he is already come, expect him still. Thus we find *all men musing in their hearts* Luke 3. 15. *of John, whether he were the Christ or not.* When *Jesus* taught in the Temple, those which doubted said, *When Christ cometh, no man knoweth whence he is;* John 7. 27. those which believed said, *When Christ cometh, will he doe moe miracles then these which this man hath done?* Vers. 31. Whether therefore they doubted, or whether they believed in *Jesus*, they all expected a *Christ* to come; and the greater their opinion was of him, the more they believed he was that *Messias*. Mary of the people said, Of a truth this is the Prophet: others said, This is the Christ. Vers. 40. 41. As soon as *John* began to baptize, the *Jews* sent *Priests* and *Levites* from *Jerusalem*, to ask him, *Who art thou?* that is, whether he were the *Christ*, or no, as appeareth out of his answer, *And he confessed and denied not, but confessed, I am not the Christ.* Vers. 20. For as they asked him after, *What then? art thou Elias?* and he said, *I am not:* *Art thou that Prophet?* and he answered, *No:* So without question their first demand was, ** Art thou the Christ?* and he answered, *I am not.* From whence it clearly appeareth that there was a general expectation among the *Jews* of a *Messias* to come; nor onely so, but it was always counted amongst them an *† Article* of their Faith, which all were obliged to believe who professed the Law of *Moses*, and whosoever denied that, was thereby interpreted to deny the Law and the Prophets. Wherefore it will be worth our enquiry to look into the grounds upon which they built that expectation.

It is most certain that the *Messias* was promised by God, both before and under the Law. God said unto *Abraham*, ** In Isaac shall thy seed be called:* and we know that was a promise of a *Messias* to come, because *S. Paul* hath taught us, *b Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, unto seeds, as of many, but as of one, and to thy seed, which is Christ.* The Lord said unto *Moses*, *I will raise them up a Prophet from among their brethren like unto thee.* And *S. Peter* hath sufficiently satisfied us, that this Prophet promised to *Moses* is *Jesus the Christ*. Many are the Prophecies which concern him, many the promises which are made of him: but yet some of them very obscure; others, though plainer, yet have relation onely to the person, not to the notion or the word *Messias*. Wheresoever he is spoken of as the Anointed, it may well be first understood of some other person; except one place in *Daniel*, where *Messiah* is foretold to be cut off: and yet even there the *Greek* Translation hath not the *Messiah*, but the *Unction*. It may therefore seem something strange, how so universal an expectation of a Redeemer under the name of the *Messias* should be spread through the Church of the *Jews*.

But if we consider that in the space of seventy years of the *Babylonish* Captivity the ordinary *Jews* had lost the exact understanding of the old *Hebrew* language before spoken in *Judea*, and therefore when the Scriptures were read unto them, they found it necessary to interpret them to the people in the *Chaldee* language, which they had lately learned: As when *Ezra* the Scribe brought the book of the Law of *Moses* before the Congregation, the *Levites* are said to have caused the people to understand the Law, because *they read* Nehem. 8. 8. *in the book, in the Law of God, distinctly, and gave the sense, and caused them to understand the reading.* Which constant interpretation begat at last a *Chaldee* Translation of the Old Testament to be read every Sabbath in the Synagogues: And that being not exactly made word for word with the *Hebrew*, but with a liberty of a brief exposition by the way, took in, together with the Text, the general opinion of the learned *Jews*. By which means it

* So Nonnus hath expressed, what is the Evangelist is to be understood; Μυστικός δ' ἄριστον ἐστὶ μυστικός ὁ δὲ μύθος τῆς τοῦ πῶ-

† Author Sopher Ikkarim, l. 4. c. ult. Maimon. Tract. de Re-
gibus, c. 11.
a Gen. 21. 12.
b Gal. 3. 16.

Acts 3. 21.

Dan. 9. 26.

* Celsus the Epicurean acknowledged both the Jews and Christians did confess that the Prophets did foretell a Saviour of the world. Οἱ δὲ τῶν Ἰουδαίων καὶ Χριστιανῶν ὡς ἀλλήλους ζητοῦντες πεισύντων μὴ ἀμφοτέρων ὅτι καὶ τοῦ Πνεύματος ἁγίου διδοῦντος Σωτῆρα τῷ γένει ᾧ ἀνθρώπων. Orig. adv. Celsum l. 3. And this Saviour, saith Origen, was to be called, καὶ τὸ Ἰουδαίων πάτρια, Χριστός.

* Gen. 49. 10.

* For in stead

of כִּי

בֶּא שִׁילֹה

Shiloh renders it,

עַד דְּיִיתִי

מִשְׁחָה

and Jonathan

and the Jeru-

salem Targ-

um, עַד זְמַן

דְּיִיתִי

מִלְכָּה

מִשְׁחָה

Beside, the

Cabalists did

generally so

interpret it,

because יבֶּא

שִׁילֹה, ac-

cording to

their compu-

tation, make

the same num-

ber with the

letters of

מִשְׁחָה: and

in the Tal-

muḍ, Coḍ,

Sanhedrim,

Rabbi Joha-

nan asking

what was the

name of the

Messias, they

of the School

of R. Schila

answer,

שִׁילֹה שְׁמוֹ

his name is

Shiloh, ac-

cording to

that which is

written, un-

till Shiloh

come.

^b Isa. 11. 10.

^c Mic. 4. 1.

^d Gen. 49. 8.

^e Mal. 3. 1.

הַאֲדָמָה

הוּא מֶלֶךְ

הַמְּשִׁיחָה

Kimchi on the

place.

came to pass that not onely the Doctrine, but the Name also, of the *Messias* was very frequent and familiar with them. Infomuch that even in the *Chaldee Paraphrase* now extant there is express mention of the *Messias* in above seventy places, beside that of *Daniel*. The * *Jews* then informed by the plain words of *Daniel*, instructed by a constant interpretation of the Law and the Prophets read in their Synagogues every Sabbath-day, relying upon the infallible predictions and promises of God, did all unanimously expect out of their own Nation, of the Tribe of *Judah*, of the Family of *David*, a *Messias*, or a *Christ*, to come.

Οἱ δὲ τῶν Ἰουδαίων καὶ Χριστιανῶν ὡς ἀλλήλους ζητοῦντες πεισύντων μὴ ἀμφοτέρων ὅτι καὶ τοῦ Πνεύματος ἁγίου διδοῦντος Σωτῆρα τῷ γένει ᾧ ἀνθρώπων. Orig. adv. Celsum l. 3. And this Saviour, saith Origen, was to be called, καὶ τὸ Ἰουδαίων πάτρια, Χριστός.

Now this being granted, as it cannot be denied, our next consideration is of the Time in which this promise was to be fulfilled: which we shall demonstrate out of the Scriptures to be past, and consequently that the promised *Messias* is already come. The prediction of *Jacob* on his death-bed is clear and pregnant: * *The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a law-giver from between his feet, untill Shiloh come; and to him shall the gathering of the people be.* But the Sceptre is departed from *Judah*, neither is there one Law-giver left between his feet. Therefore *Shiloh*, that is, the *Messias*, is already come. That the *Jewish* government hath totally failed, is not without the greatest folly to be denied: and therefore that *Shiloh* is already come, except we should deny the truth of Divine predictions, must be granted. There remains then nothing to be proved, but that by *Shiloh* is to be understood the *Messias*: which is sufficiently manifest both from the consent of the ancient *Jews*, and from the description immediately added to the name. For * all the old Paraphrasts call him expressly the *Messias*, and the words which follow, *to him shall the gathering of the people be*, speak no less; as giving an explication of his Person, Office, or Condition, who was but darkly described in the name of *Shiloh*. For this is the same character by which he was signified unto *Abraham*; *In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed*: by which he is decyphered in *Isaiah*; ^b *In that day there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign of the people; to it shall the Gentiles seek, and his rest shall be glorious*: and in *Micah*, ^c *The mountain of the House of the Lord shall be established on the top of the mountains, and it shall be exalted above the hills, and people shall flow unto it.* And thus the blessing of *Judah* is plainly intelligible: ^d *Judah, thou art he whom thy brethren shall praise; thy hand shall be in the neck of thine enemies, thy father's children shall bow down before thee. Thou shalt obtain the primogeniture of thy brother Reuben, and by virtue thereof shalt rule over the rest of the Tribes: the government shall be upon thy shoulders, and all thy brethren shall be subject unto thee.* And that you may understand this blessing is not to expire untill it make way for a greater, know that this government shall not fail, untill there come a son out of your loyns who shall be far greater then your self: for whereas your dominion reacheth onely over your brethren, and so is confined unto the Tribes of *Israel*; his kingdom shall be universal, and all nations of the earth shall serve him. Being then this *Shiloh* is so described in the text, and acknowledged by the ancient *Jews* to be the *Messias*; being God had promised by *Jacob* the government of *Israel* should not fail untill *Shiloh* came; being that government is visibly and undeniably already failed: it followeth inevitably, that the *Messias* is already come.

In the same manner the Prophet *Malachy* hath given an express signification of the coming of the *Messias* while the Temple stood. ^e *Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me; and the Lord whom ye seek shall*

shall suddenly come to his Temple, even the messenger of the Covenant whom ye delight in. And Haggai yet more clearly; Thus saith the Lord of hosts, *Yet once it is a little while, and I will shake the heavens, and the earth, and the sea, and the dry land; And I will shake all nations; and the desire of all nations shall come: and I will fill this house with glory, saith the Lord of hosts. The glory of this latter house shall be greater then the glory of the former, saith the Lord of hosts.* ^{Hag. 2. 6, 7, 9.} It is then most evident from these predictions, that the *Messias* was to come while the second Temple stood. It is as certain that the second Temple is not now standing. Therefore, except we contradict the Veracity of God, it cannot be denied but the *Messias* is already come. Nothing can be objected to enervate this argument, but that these Prophecies concern not the *Messias*; and yet the ancient *Jews* confessed they did, and that they do so cannot be denied. For, first, those titles, *the Angel of the Covenant, the delight of the Israelites, the desire of all nations*, are certain and known characters of the *Christ* to come. And, secondly, it cannot be conceived how the glory of the second Temple should be greater then the glory of the first, without the coming of the *Messias* to it. For the *Jews* themselves have observed that five signs of the Divine glory were in the first Temple, which were wanting to the second: as the Urim and Thummim, by which the High Priest was miraculously instructed of the will of God; the Ark of the Covenant, from whence God gave his answers by a clear and audible voice; the Fire upon the Altar, which came down from Heaven, and immediately consumed the Sacrifice; the Divine presence or habitation with them, represented by a visible appearance, or given, as it were, to the King and High Priest by anointing with the oyl of unction; and, lastly, the Spirit of Prophecy, with which those especially who were called to the prophetic office were indued. And there was no comparison between the beauty and glory of the structure or building of it, as appeared by the tears dropt from those eyes which had beheld the former, (*For many of the Priests and Levites, and chief of the Fathers, who were ancient men, that had seen the first House, when the foundation of this House was laid before their eyes, wept with a loud voice;*) ^{Ezra 3. 12.} and by those words which God commanded Haggai to speak to the people for the introducing of this Prophecy, *Who is left among you that saw this House in her first glory? and how do ye see it now? is it not in your eyes in comparison of it as nothing?* ^{Hag. 2. 3.} Being then the structure of the second Temple was so far inferiour to the first, being all those signs of the Divine glory were wanting in it with which the former was adorned; the glory of it can no other way be imagined greater, then by the coming of him into it in whom all those signs of the Divine glory were far more eminently contained: and this Person alone is the *Messias*. For he was to be the glory of the people *Israel*, yea even of the God of *Israel*; he the Urim and Thummim, by whom the will of God, as by a greater Oracle, was revealed; he the true Ark of the Covenant, the onely Propitiatory by his blood; he which was to baptize with the Holy Ghost and with fire, the true Fire which came down from Heaven; he which was to take up his habitation in our flesh, and to dwell among us, that we might behold his glory; he who received the Spirit without measure, and from whose fulness we do all receive. In him were all those signs of the Divine glory united, which were thus divided in the first Temple; in him they were all more eminently contained then in those: therefore his coming to the second Temple was, as the sufficient, so the onely, means by which the glory of it could be greater then the glory of the first. If then the *Messias* was to come while the second Temple stood, as appeareth by God's prediction and promise; if that Temple many Ages since hath ceased to be, there being not one stone left upon a stone; if it certainly were before the destruction of it in

greater glory then ever the former was; if no such glory could accrue unto it but by the coming of the *Messias*: then is that *Messias* already come.

Having thus demonstrated out of the Promises given to the *Jews*, that the *Messias* who was so promised unto them must be already come, because those events which were foretold to follow his coming are already past; we shall proceed unto the next particular, and prove that the man *Jesus*, in whom we believe, is that *Messias* who was promised. First, it is acknowledged both by the *Jew* and *Gentile*, that this *Jesus* was born in *Judea*, and lived and died there, before the Commonwealth of *Israel* was dispersed, before the second Temple was destroyed, that is, at the very time when the Prophets foretold the *Messias* should come. And there was no other beside him that did with any shew of probability pretend to be, or was accepted as, the *Messias*. Therefore we must confess he was, and onely he could be, the *Christ*.

Secondly, all other Prophecies belonging to the *Messias* were fulfilled in *Jesus*, whether we look upon the Family, the Place, or the manner of his Birth; neither were they ever fulfilled in any person beside him: he then is, and no other can be, the *Messias*. That he was to come out of the Tribe of *Judah* and Family of *David*, is every where manifest. * The *Jews*, which mention *Messias* as a son of *Joseph* or of *Ephraim*, do not deny, but rather dignifie, the Son of *David* or of *Judah*, whom they confess to be the greater *Christ*. † There shall come forth a † rod out of the stemme of *Jesse*, and a branch shall grow out of his roots, and the spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, saith the Prophet *Isaiah*. And again, ‡ In that day there shall be a root of *Jesse*, which shall stand for an ensign of the people: to it shall the *Gentiles* seek, and his rest shall be glorious. Now who was it but *Jesus* of whom the Elders spake, § Behold the Lion of the tribe of *Judah*, the root of *David*? who but he said, ¶ I am the root and offspring of *David*, and the bright and morning star? The *Jews* did all acknowledge it, as appears by the question of our Saviour, † How say the Scribes that *Christ* is the son of *David*? ‡ What think ye of *Christ*? whose son is he? They say unto him, the son of *David*: and that of the people, amazed at the seeing of the blind, and speaking of the dumb, ¶ Is not this the son of *David*? The blind cried out unto him, *Jesus*, thou son of *David*, have mercy on us; and the multitude cried, § Hosanna to the son of *David*. The Genealogy of *Jesus* shews his Family: the first words of the Gospel are, ¶ The book of the generation of *Jesus Christ*, the son of *David*. The Prophecy therefore was certainly fulfilled in respect of his lineage; § for it is evident that our Lord sprang out of *Judah*.

Beside, if we look upon the Place where the *Messias* was to be born, we shall find that *Jesus* by a particular act of providence was born there. When Herod gathered all the chief Priests and Scribes of the people together, he demanded of them where *Christ* should be born. And they said unto him, In *Bethlehem* of *Judea*. The people doubted whether *Jesus* was the *Christ*, because they thought he had been born in *Galilee*, where *Joseph* and *Mary* lived; wherefore they said, ¶ Shall *Christ* come out of *Galilee*? Hath not the Scripture said, that *Christ* cometh of the seed of *David*, and out of the town of *Bethlehem*, where *David* was? That place of Scripture which they meant was cited by the Scribes to Herod, according to the interpretation then current among the *Jews*, and still preserved in the * *Chaldee Paraphrase*. † For thus it is written in the Prophet, And thou *Bethlehem* in the land of *Judah* art not the least among the princes of

* The *Jews* have invented a double *Messias*: to one they attribute all those pl. es which mention his low estate and sufferings; to the other such as speak of his power and glory. The one they style

משיח בן יוסף, the other משיח בן דוד.

The son of *Joseph* they name also the son of *Ephraim*, and the son of *David* the son of *Judah*: as the Targum Cant. 4. 5. Thy two breasts are like two young roes,

תרוין מריקד

משיח בן דוד ומשיח בן אפרים

Two are thy redeemers, *Messias* the son of *David*, and

Messias the son of *Ephraim*. * *Isa.* 11. 1, 10. † which the *Chaldee Paraphrase* thus translates, ויפוך מלכות מבנויו, וישי ומשיחא מבני בנויו וידבי A king shall come of the sons of *Jesse*, and the *Messias* out of his sons sons. So *Rabbi Solomon* and *Kimchi*. † *Rev.* 5. 5. and 22. 16. † *Mat.* 12. 35. † *Mat.* 22. 42. † *Mat.* 12. 23. † *Mat.* 21. 9. † *Mat.* 1. 1. † *Heb.* 7. 14. † *Mat.* 2. 4. † *Joba* 7. 41, 42. * which expressly translates it thus, מן קדמי יפוך משיחא למדוי, Out of thee shall come before me the *Messias*, that he may exercise domination in *Israel*. So *R. Solomon*, עבד שולטן על ישראל. ממך לי יצא משיח בן דוד. So *Kimchi* and *Abu binel* דוד מלך המשיח. † *Mat.* 2. 5, 6.

‡ *Judah*,

Judah, for out of thee shall come a governour that shall rule my people Israel. This prediction was most manifestly and remarkably fulfilled in the Birth of Jesus, when by the providence of God it was so ordered that Augustus should then tax the world, to which end every one should go up into his own City. Whereupon Joseph and Mary his espoused Wife left Nazareth of Galilee, their habitation, and went unto Bethlehem of Judaea, the City of David, there to be taxed, because they were of the house and lineage of David. And while they were there, as the days of the Virgin Mary were accomplished, so the prophecy was fulfilled: for there she brought forth her first-born son; and so unto us was born that day in the City of David a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord. Luke 2. 4.

But if we adde unto the Family and Place, the manner of his Birth also foretold, the argument must necessarily appear conclusive. The Prophet *Isaiah* spake thus unto the house of David; *The Lord himself shall give you a sign: Behold, a Virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel.* What nativity could be more congruous to the greatness of a *Messias* then that of a Virgin, which is most miraculous? what name can be thought fitter for him then that of *Immanuel, God with us*, whose Land *Judea* is said to be? The *Immanuel* then thus born of a Virgin was without question the true *Messias*. And we know *Jesus* was thus born of the blessed Virgin *Mary*, that it might be fulfilled which was thus spoken of the Lord by the Prophet. Isa. 7. 14.
Isa. 8. 8.
Matt. 1. 22.

Wherefore being all the prophecies concerning the Family, Place and manner of the Birth of the *Messias* were fulfilled in *Jesus*, and not so much as pretended to be accomplished in any other; it is again from hence apparent that this *Jesus* is the *Christ*.

Thirdly, he which taught what the *Messias* was to teach, did what the *Messias* was to doe, suffered what the *Messias* was to suffer, and by suffering obtained all which a *Messias* could obtain, must be acknowledged of necessity to be the true *Messias*. But all this is manifestly true of *Jesus*. Therefore we must confesse he is the *Christ*. For first, it cannot be denied that he was promised as a Prophet and Teacher of the people. So God promised him to *Moses*; *I will raise them up a Prophet from among their brethren like unto thee.* So *Isaiah*, *Ezekiel* and *Hoseah* have expressed him, as we shall hereafter have farther occasion to shew. And not onely so, but as a greater Prophet, and more perfect Doctour, then ever any was which preceded him, more universal then they all. *I have put my spirit upon him, saith God: he shall bring forth judgement to the Gentiles, and the Isles shall wait for his law.* Now it is as evident that *Jesus* of Nazareth was the most perfect Prophet, the * Prince and Lord of all the Prophets, Doctours and Pastours, which either preceded or succeeded him. For he hath revealed unto us the most perfect will of God both in his precepts and his promises. He hath delivered the same after the most perfect manner, with the greatest authority; not like *Moses* and the Prophets, saying, *Thus saith the Lord*, but, ^a *I say unto you*; nor like the Interpreters of *Moses*, for ^b *he taught them as one having authority, and not as the Scribes*: with the greatest perspicuity, not, as those before him, under types and shadows, but plainly and clearly; from whence both he and his Doctrine is frequently called *Light*: with the greatest universality, as preaching that Gospel which is to unite all the Nations of the earth into one Church, that there might be one Shepherd and one Flock. Whatsoever then that great Prophet the *Messias* was to teach, that *Jesus* taught; and whatsoever works he was to doe, those *Jesus* did.

When *John* the Baptist had heard the works of *Christ*, he sent two of his Disciples with this message to him, *Art thou he that should come, or do we look for another?* And *Jesus* returned this answer unto him, shewing the ground of

that message, *the works of Christ*, was a sufficient resolution of the question sent; *Go and shew John again those things which ye do hear and see: The blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, and the dead are raised up.* And as *Jesus* alledged the works which he wrought to be a sufficient testimony that he was the *Messias*; so did those *Jews* acknowledge it, who said, *When Christ cometh, will he doe more miracles then these which this man doth?* And *Nicodemus*, a Ruler among them, confessed little less: *Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher come from God; for no man can doe these miracles that thou doest, except God be with him.* Great and many were the miracles which *Moses* and the rest of the Prophets wrought for the ratification of the Law, and the demonstration of God's constant presence with his people; and yet all those wrought by so many several persons, in the space of above three thousand years, are far short of those which this one *Jesus* did perform within the compass of three years. The ambitious diligence of the *Jews* hath reckoned up seventy six miracles for *Moses*, and seventy four for all the rest of the Prophets: and supposing that they were so many, (though indeed they were not) how few are they in respect of those which are written of our Saviour! how inconsiderable, if compared with all which he wrought! when *S. John* testifieth with as great certainty of truth as height of Hyperbole, that *there are many other things which Jesus did, the which if they should be written every one, he supposed that even the world it self could not contain the books that should be written.* Nor did our Saviour excell all others in the number of his miracles onely, but in the power of working. Whatsoever miracle *Moses* wrought, he either obtained by his prayers, or else, consulting with God, received it by command from him; so that the power of miracles cannot be conceived as immanent or inhering in him. Whereas this power must of necessity be in *Jesus*, in whom dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead bodily, and to whom the Father had given to have life in himself. This he sufficiently shewed by working with a word, by commanding the winds to be still, the Devils to fly, and the dead to rise: by working without a word or any intervenient sign; as when the woman which had an issue of bloud twelve years touched his garment, and straightway the fountain of her bloud was dried up by the virtue which flowed out from the greater fountain of his power. And lest this example should be single, we find that the men of *Genesaret*, the people out of all *Judea* and *Jerusalem*, and from the sea-coast of *Tyre* and *Sidon*, even the whole multitude sought to touch him; for there went virtue out of him, and healed them all. Once indeed *Christ* seemeth to have prayed, before he raised *Lazarus* from the grave; but even that was done because of the people which stood by: not that he had not power within himself to raise up *Lazarus*, who was afterward to raise himself; but that they might believe the Father had sent him. The immanency and inherency of this power in *Jesus* is evident in this; that he was able to communicate it to whom he pleased, and actually did conferr it upon his Disciples: *Behold, I give unto you power to tread on serpents and scorpions, and over all the power of the enemy.* Upon the Apostles: *Heal the sick, cleanse the lepers, raise the dead, cast out devils; freely ye have received, freely give.* Upon the first Believers: *These signs shall follow them that believe; in my name they shall cast out devils. He that believeth on me, the works that I doe shall he doe also; and greater works then these shall he doe.* He then which did more actions divine and powerfull then *Moses* and all the Prophets ever did, he which performed them in a manner far more divine then that by which they wrought, hath done all which can be expected the *Messias*, foretold by them, should doe.

Nor hath our *Jesus* onely done, but suffered, all which the *Messias* was to suffer. For we must not with the *Jews* deny a suffering *Christ*, or fondly of our

OWN

zealous pretence of a likeness not to be denied, which 800 years since was known by none, every several Country having a several Image. It hence came that argument of the Iconoclasts by way of Quere, which of those Images was the true: Πότερον ἡ πᾶσι 'Ρωμαίοις, ἢ ἑνὶ ἑκάστῳ γένει, ἢ ἡ πᾶσι 'Ελλήσιν, ἢ ἡ πᾶσι Αἰγυπτίοις; ἢ ἡ ἑκάστῃ ἀλλήλῃ αὐτῶν. And well might none of these be like another, when every nation painted our Saviour in the nearest similitude to the people of their own country. Ἐλλῆες μὲν αὐτοῖς ὅμοιον ἐπὶ τῆς φωνῆς τὸν Χριστὸν νομίζουσιν, 'Ρωμαῖοι δὲ μάλλον αὐτοῖς εἰκότα. Ἰσδι δὲ πάλιν κορεθὸν τῇ αὐτῇ, καὶ Αἰθίοπες δὴλον ὡς αὐτοῖς. Photius, Epist. 64. And the difference of opinions in this kind is sufficiently apparent out of those words in Suidas, Ἰστέον δὲ ἐπὶ παντὶ οἱ ἀνεκρίβεται ὅτι ἰσχυρῶν, ὡς τὸ ἔλρον καὶ ἀλιγρότερον οἰκεῖότερον δεῖ γράφειν ἐπὶ τῆς εἰκόνος τοῦ Χριστοῦ.

Phil. 2. 6, 7. confessed the fulfilling of it in the body of our Saviour. But what the aspect of his outward appearance was, because the Scriptures are silent, we cannot now know: and it is enough that we are assured, the state and condition of his life was in the eye of the Jews without honour and inglorious. For though, being himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant. For thirty years he lived with his mother Mary, and Joseph his reputed father, of a mean profession, and was subject to them. When he left his mother's house, and entered on his prophetic office, he passed from place to place, sometimes received into a house, other times lodging in the fields: for while the foxes have holes, and the birds of the air have nests, the Son of man had not where to lay his head. From this low estate of life and condition, seemingly inglorious, arose in the Jews a neglect of his works, and contempt of his doctrine. ^a Is not this the Carpenter's son? nay farther, ^b Is not this ^c the Carpenter, the son of Mary? and they were offended at him. Thus was it fulfilled in him, he was despised and rejected of men, and they esteemed him not.

This contempt of his personage, condition, doctrine and works, was by degrees raised to hatred, detestation, and persecution to a cruel and ignominious death. All which if we look upon in the gross, we must acknowledge it fulfilled in him to the highest degree imaginable, that he was ^c a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief. But if we compare the particular predictions with the historical passages of his sufferings, if we joyn the Prophets and Evangelists together, it will most manifestly appear the Messiah was to suffer nothing which Christ hath not suffered. If Zachary say, ^d they weighed for my price thirty pieces of silver; S. Matthew will shew that Judas sold Jesus at the same rate: for the chief Priests covenanted with him for thirty pieces of silver. If Isaiah say that he was wounded, if Zachary, they shall look upon me whom they have pierced, if the Prophet David yet more particularly, they pierced my hands and my feet; the Evangelist will shew how he was fastened to the Cross, and Jesus himself the print of the nails. If the Psalmist tell us, they should laugh him to scorn, and shake their head, saying, He trusted in the Lord that he would deliver him; let him deliver him, seeing he delighted in him; S. Matthew will describe the same action, and the same expression: For they that passed by reviled him, wagging their heads, and saying, He trusted in God, let him deliver him now, if he will have him; for he said, I am the Son of God. Let David say, My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me? and the Son of David will shew in whose person the Father spake it, Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani. Let Isaiah foretell, he was numbred with the transgressours; and you shall find him crucified between two thieves, one on his right hand, the other on his left. Reade in the Psalmist, In my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink; and you shall find in the Evangelist, Jesus, that the Scripture might be fulfilled, said, I thirst: And they took a sponge, and filled it with vinegar, and put it on a reed, and gave him to drink. Reade farther yet, They part my garments among them, and cast lots upon my vesture; and, to fulfill the prediction, the Souldiers shall make good the distinction, who took his garments, and made four parts, to every souldier a part, and also his coat: now the coat was without seam, woven from the top throughout. They said therefore among themselves, Let us not rend it, but cast lots for it, whose it shall be.

Lastly,

Lastly, let the Prophets teach us, that *he shall be brought like a lamb to the slaughter, and be cut off out of the land of the living*; all the Evangelists will declare how like a Lamb he suffered, and the very Jews will acknowledge that he was cut off. And now may we well conclude, *Thus it is written, and thus it behoved the Christ to suffer*; and what it so behoved him to suffer, that he suffered.

Neither onely in his Passion, but after his death all things were fulfilled in Jesus which were prophesied concerning the *Messias*. *He made his grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death*, saith the Prophet of the *Christ* to come: and as the thieves were buried with whom he was crucified, so was Jesus, but laid in the Tomb of *Joseph of Arimathæa*, an honourable Counsellour. *After two days will he revive us, in the third day he will raise us up*, saith *Hosea* of the people of *Israel*: in whose language they were the * type of *Christ*; and the third day Jesus rose from the dead. *The Lord said unto my Lord, sit thou at my right hand. Now David is not ascended into the heavens*, and consequently cannot be set at the right hand of God; but Jesus is already ascended, and set down at the right hand of God: and so all the house of *Israel* might know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom they crucified, both Lord and *Christ*. For, he who taught whatsoever the *Messias*, promised by God, foretold by the Prophets, expected by the people of God, was to teach; he who did all which that *Messias* was by virtue of that office to doe; he which suffered all those pains and indignities which that *Messias* was to suffer; he to whom all things happened after his death, the period of his sufferings, which were according to the Divine predictions to come to pass; he, I say, must infallibly be the true *Messias*. But Jesus alone taught, did, suffered and obtained all these things, as we have shewed. Therefore we may again infallibly conclude that our Jesus is the *Christ*.

Fourthly, if it were the proper note and character of the *Messias*, that all Nations should come in to serve him; if the Doctrine of Jesus hath been preached and received in all parts of the world, according to that character so long before delivered; if it were absolutely impossible that the Doctrine revealed by Jesus should have been so propagated as it hath been, had it not been Divine; then must this Jesus be the *Messias*: and when we have proved these three particulars, we may safely conclude he is the *Christ*.

That all Nations were to come in to the *Messias*, and so the distinction between the Jew and Gentile to cease at his coming, is the most universal description in all the prophecies. God speaks to him thus, as to his Son; *Ask of me, and I will give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession*. It was one greater then *Solomon* of whom these words were spoken, *All kings shall fall down before him, all nations shall serve him. It shall come to pass in the last days*, saith *Isaiah*, *that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills, and all nations shall flow unto it*. And again, *In that day there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign of the people; to it shall the Gentiles seek*. And in general, all the Prophets were but instruments to deliver the same message, which *Malachy* concludes, from God: *From the rising of the sun, even to the going down of the same, my name shall be great among the Gentiles, and in every place incense shall be offered unto my name, and a pure offering: for my name shall be great among the heathen*, saith the Lord of hosts. Now being the bounds of *Judea* were settled, being the promise of God was to bring all nations in at the coming of the *Messias*, being this was it which the Jews so much opposed, as loth to part from their ancient and peculiar privilege; he which actually wrought this work must certainly be the *Messias*: and that Jesus did it, is most evident.

That all nations did thus come in to the Doctrine preached by Jesus, cannot be denied. For although he ^a were not sent but to the lost sheep of the house of Israel; although of those many Israelites which believed on him while he lived very few were left immediately after his death: yet when the Apostles had received their Commission from him to ^b go teach all nations, and were ^c endued with power from on high by the plentiful effusion of the holy Ghost; the first day there was an accession of ^d three thousand souls; immediately after we find ^e the number of the men, beside women, was about five thousand; and still ^f believers were more added to the Lord, multitudes both of men and women. Upon the persecution at Jerusalem, they went through the ^g regions of Judea, Galilee and Samaria, and so the Gospel spread; insomuch that S. James the Bishop of Jerusalem spake thus unto S. Paul, ^h Thou seest, brother, how many thousands (or rather, how many myriads, that is, ten thousands) of the Jews there are which believe. Beside, how great was the number of the believing Jews strangers, scattered through Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, Bithynia, and the rest of the Roman Provinces, will appear out of the Epistles of S. Peter, S. James, and S. John. And yet all these are nothing to the fulness of the Gentiles which came after. First, those which were before Gentile-worshippers, acknowledging the same God with the Jews, but not receiving the Law: who had before abandoned their old Idolatry, and already embraced the true Doctrine of one God, and did confess the Deity which the Jews did worship to be that onely true God; but yet refused to be circumcised, and so to oblige themselves to the keeping of the whole Law. Now the Apostles preaching the same God with Moses, whom they all acknowledged, and teaching that Circumcision and the rest of the legal Ceremonies were now abrogated, which those men would never admit, they were with the greatest facility converted to the Christian Faith. For being present at the Synagogues of the Jews, and understanding much of the Law, they were of all the Gentiles readiest to hear, and most capable of the Arguments which the Apostles produced out of the Scriptures to prove that Jesus was the Christ. Thus many of the ⁱ Greeks which came up to worship at Jerusalem, ^k devout men out of every nation under heaven, not men of Israel, but yet fearing God, did first embrace the Christian Faith. After them the rest of the Gentiles left the idolatrous worship of their heathen gods, and in a short time in infinite multitudes received the Gospel. How much did Jesus work by one S. Paul to ^l the obedience of the Gentiles by word and deed? how did he pass from Jerusalem round about through Phœnice, Syria and Arabia, through Asia, Achaia and Macedonia, even to Illyricum, fully preaching the Gospel of Christ? How far did others pass beside S. Paul, that he should speak even of his time, that the ^m Gospel was preached to every creature under heaven? Many were the Nations, innumerable the people, which received the Faith in the Apostles days: and in not many years after, notwithstanding millions were cut off in their bloody persecutions, yet did their ⁿ numbers equallize half the Roman Empire: and little above two Ages after the death of the last Apostle, the Emperours of the world gave in their names to Christ, and submitted their sceptres to his laws, that the ^o Gentiles might come to his light, and Kings to the brightness of his rising; that ^p Kings might become the nursing fathers, and Queens the nursing mothers, of the Church.

Parti, vel quantacunque unius tamen loci & suorum finium gentes, quam totius orbis? Hesterni sumus, & vestra omnia implevimus, urbes, insulas, castella, municipia, conciliabula, castra ipsa, tribus, decurias, palatium, senatum, forum. Id. Apolog. c. 36. Potuimus & inermes, nec rebelles, sed tantummodo discordes, solius divortii invidia adversus vos dimicasse. Si enim tanta vis hominum in aliquem orbis remoti finem abruptissimus à vobis, suffuderit utique dominationem vestram tot qualiumcunque amissiono civium, imo etiam & ipsa destituitone punisset; proculdubio expavisset ad solitudinem vestram, ad silentium rerum, & stuporem quandam quasi mortuæ urbis; quæsissetis quibus in ea imperassetis. Id. ibid. And Irenæus, who wrote before Tertullian, and is mentioned by him, speaks of the Christians in his time living in the Court of Rome: Quid autem & hi qui in regali aula sunt fideles? nonne ex eis quæ Cæsaris sunt habent utensilia, & hi qui non habent unicuique secundum suam veritatem præstat? ^q Isa. 60. 3. ^r Isa. 49. 23.

From

From hence it came to pass that, according to all the predictions of the Prophets, the one God of *Israel*, the Maker of Heaven and earth, was acknowledged through the world for the onely true God: that the Law given to *Israel* was taken for the true Law of God, but as given to that people, and so to cease when they ceased to be a people; except the moral part thereof, which, as an universal rule common to all people, is still acknowledged for the Law of God, given unto all, and obliging every man: that all the Oracles of the Heathen Gods, in all places where Christianity was received, did presently cease; and all the Idols, or the Gods themselves, were rejected and condemned as spurious. For the Lord of Hosts had spoken concerning those times exprelly; *It shall come to pass, in that day, that I will cut off the names of the Idols out of the land, and they shall no more be remembered: also I will cause the prophets and the unclean spirit to pass out of the land.* Zach. 13. 2.

Now being this general reception of the Gospel was so anciently, so frequently, foretold, being the same was so clearly and universally performed, even this might seem sufficient to persuade that *Jesus is Christ*. But lest any should not yet be fully satisfied, we shall farther shew, that it is impossible *Jesus* should have been so received for the true *Messias*, had he not been so; or that his Doctrine, which teacheth him to be the *Christ*, should be admitted by all nations for divine, had it not been such. For whether we look upon the Nature of the Doctrine taught, the Condition of the Teachers of it, or the Manner in which it was taught, it can no way seem probable that it should have had any such success, without the immediate working of the hand of God, acknowledging *Jesus* for his Son, the Doctrine for his own, and the fulfilling by the hands of the Apostles what he had foretold by the Prophets.

As for the Nature of the Doctrine, it was no way likely to have any such success. For, first, it absolutely condemned all other Religions, settled and corroborated by a constant succession of many Ages, under which many nations and kingdoms, and especially at that time the *Roman*, had signally flourished. Secondly, it contained Precepts far more ungratefull and troublesome to flesh and blood, and contrariant to the general inclination of mankind; as the abnegation of our selves, the mortifying of the flesh, the love of our enemies, and the bearing of the Cross. Thirdly, it enforced those Precepts seemingly unreasonable, by such Promises as were as seemingly incredible and unperceivable. For they were not of the good things of this world, or such as afford any complacency to our Sense; but of such as cannot be obtained till after this life, and necessarily presuppose that which then seemed as absolutely impossible, the Resurrection. Fourthly, it delivered certain predictions which were to be fulfilled in the persons of such as should embrace it, which seem sufficient to have kept most part of the world from listning to it, as dangers, losses, afflictions, tribulations, and, in summe, *All that would live godly in Christ Jesus should suffer persecution.* 2 Tim. 3. 12

If we look upon the Teachers of this Doctrine, there appeared nothing in them which could promise any such success. The first Revealer and Promulger bred in the house of a Carpenter, brought up at the feet of no Professour, despised by the High-priests, the Scribes and Pharisees, and all the learned in the Religion of his Nation; in the time of his preaching apprehended, bound, buffeted, spit upon, condemned, crucified; betrayed in his life by one Disciple, denied by another; at his death distrusted by all. What advantage can we perceive toward the propagation of the Gospel in this Authour of it, *Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumbling-block, and unto the Greeks foolishness?* 1 Cor. 1. 23

What in those which followed him, sent by him, and thence called Apostles,

men by birth obscure, by education illiterate, by profession low and inglorious? How can we conceive that all the Schools and Universities of the world should give way to them, and the Kingdoms and Empires should at last come in to them, except their Doctrine were indeed Divine, except that *Jesus*, whom they testified to be the *Christ*, were truly so?

1 Cor. 1. 4.

If we consider the manner in which they delivered this Doctrine to the world, it will add no advantage to their persons, or advance the probability of success. For in their delivery they used no such rhetoricall expressions, or ornaments of eloquence, to allure or entice the world; they affected no such subtilty of wit, or strength of argumentation, as thereby to persuade and convince men; they made use of no force or violence to compell, no corporal menaces to affright mankind unto a compliance. But in a plain simplicity of words they nakedly delivered what they had seen and heard, *preaching, not with enticing words of man's wisdom, but in the demonstration of the Spirit.* It is not then rationally imaginable, that so many Nations should forsake their own religions, so many Ages professed, and brand them all as damnable, onely that they might embrace such precepts as were most unacceptable to their natural inclinations, and that upon such promises as seemed not probable to their reason, nor could have any influence on their sense, and notwithstanding those predictions which did assure them, upon the receiving of that Doctrine, to be exposed to all kind of misery: that they should doe this upon the Authority of him who for the same was condemned and crucified, and by the persuasion of them who were both illiterate and obscure: that they should be enticed with words without eloquence, convinced without the least subtilty, constrained without any force. I say, it is no way imaginable how this should come to pass, had not the Doctrine of the Gospel, which did thus prevail, been certainly Divine; had not the light of the Word, which thus dispelled the clouds of all former Religions, come from Heaven; had not that *Jesus*, the author and finisher of our faith, been the true *Messias*.

* In Christi
nomine sub-
auditur qui
unxit, &
ipse qui un-
ctus est, &
ipsa unctio
in qua un-
ctus est. *Iren.*
l. 3. c. 20.

† Οὐ βαπ-
τίζεις ἄνθρω-
πὸν ὅτι ἔχεις
ὕδωρ καὶ τὸ
πῶς βα-
πτίζεις καὶ
ὅτι ἔχεις
σοὶ. *Iust.*

Mart. Dial.

* Christus à
chrismate di-
citur: quia
sicut antiqui
reges à sacer-
dotibus oleo
sacro profun-
debantur, sic
Christus Sp.
S. infusione
repletus est.

Author Serm.
131. de Temp.

* 1 Sam. 15. 1.

* Chap. 16. 12.

† Sicut nunc

Romanis in-

dumentum

purpuræ in-

signe est re-

giæ dignita-

tis assumptæ:

sic illis un-

ctio sacri un-

guenti no-

men ac pote-

statem regi-

um confere-

bat. *Lactan.*

l. 4. c. 7.

To conclude this discourse. He who was in the world at the time when the *Messias* was to come, and no other at that time or since pretended; he who was born of the same family, in the same place, after the same manner, which the Prophets foretold of the birth of the *Messias*; he which taught all those truths, wrought all those miracles, suffered all those indignities, received all that glory, which the *Messias* was to teach, doe, suffer, and receive; he whose Doctrine was received in all nations, according to the character of the *Messias*; He was certainly the true *Messias*. But we have already sufficiently shewed that all these things are exactly fulfilled in *Jesus*, and in him alone. We must therefore acknowledge and profess that this *Jesus* is the promised *Messias*, that is, the *Christ*.

Having thus manifested the truth of this proposition, *Jesus is the Christ*, and shewed the interpretation of the word *Christ* to be *Anointed*; we find it yet * necessary for the explication of this Article, to enquire what was the end or immediate effect of his Unction, and how or in what manner he was anointed to that end.

For the first, as the *Messias* was foretold, so was he typified: nor were the actions prescribed under the Law less predictive then the words of the Prophets. Nay, † whosoever were then anointed, were therefore so, because he was to be anointed. Now it is evident that among the *Jews* they were wont to * anoint those which were appointed as Kings over them: So *Samuel said unto Saul, The Lord sent me to anoint thee to be King over his people, over Israel.* When *Saul* was rejected, and *David* produced before *Samuel*, *the Lord said, Arise, anoint him, for this is he.* And some † may have contented themselves

with

Prophet; a translation from the state of death into eternal life is not to be effected without absolute authority and irresistible power, therefore a King was also necessary. The *Messias* then, the Redeemer of *Israel*, was certainly anointed for that end, that he might become Prophet, Priest, and King. And if we believe him whom we call *Jesus*, that is, our Saviour and Redeemer, to be *Christ*, we must assert him by his *Unction* sent to perform all these three Offices.

That *Jesus* was anointed to the Prophetical Office, though we need no more to prove it then the prediction of *Isaiah*, *The spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the Gospel to the poor*; the explication of our Saviour, *This day is this Scripture fulfilled in your ears*; and the confession of the Synagogue at *Nazareth*, who all bare him witness, and wondered at the gracious words which proceeded out of his mouth: yet we are furnished with more ample and plentiful demonstrations: for whether we consider his Preparation, his Mission, or his Administration, all of them speak him fully to have performed it. To *Jeremiah* indeed God said, *Before thou camest forth out of the womb, I sanctified thee, and I ordained thee a Prophet unto the Nations*; and of *John* the Baptist, *He shall be filled with the holy Ghost, even from his mother's womb*. And if these became singular Prophets by their preparative sanctification, how much more eminent must his prophetical preparation be, to whose mother it is said, *The holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee*? If the *Levites* must be thirty years old, every one that came to do the service of the ministry; *Jesus* will not enter upon the publick administration of this Office till he begin to be about thirty years of age. Then doth the holy Ghost descend in a bodily shape like a Dove upon him: then must a voice come from heaven, saying, *Thou art my beloved Son, in thee I am well pleased*. Never such preparations, never such an Inauguration of a Prophet.

As for his Mission, never any was confirmed with such letters of credence, such irrefragable testimonials, as the formal testimony of *John* the Baptist, and the more virtual testimony of his Miracles. Behold, *I will send you Elijah the Prophet before the coming of the great and dreadfull day of the Lord*, saith God by *Malachy*. And *John* went before him in the spirit of *Elias*, saith another *Malachy*, even an Angel from Heaven. This *John*, or *Elias*, saw the Spirit descend on *Jesus*, and bare record that this is the Son of God. The *Jews* took notice of this testimony, who said unto him, *Rabbi, he that was with thee beyond Jordan, to whom thou barest witness, behold, the same baptizeth, and all men come unto him*; and *Jesus* himself puts them in mind of it, *Ye sent unto John, and he bare witness unto the truth*; nay they themselves confessed his testimony to be undeniable, *John did no miracle, but all things that John spake of this man were true*. But though the witness of *John* were thus cogent, yet the testimony of Miracles was far more irrefragable. *I have greater witness then that of John*, saith our Saviour; *for the works which my Father hath given me to finish, the same works that I doe bear witness of me, that the Father hath sent me*. Notwithstanding the precedent record of *John*, *Jesus* requireth not an absolute assent unto his Doctrine without his Miracles: *If I doe not the works of my Father, believe me not*. But upon them he challengeth belief: *But if I doe, though ye believe not me, believe the works; that ye may know and believe that the Father is in me, and I in him*. If then *Moses* and other Prophets, to whom God gave the power of Miracles, did assert their mission to be from God by the Divine works which they wrought; much more efficacious to this purpose must the Miracles of *Jesus* appear, who wrought more wonders then they all. Never therefore was there so manifest a Mission of a Prophet.

Now

Now the Prophetical Function consisteth in the promulgation, confirmation, and perpetuation of the Doctrine containing the will of God for the Salvation of Man. And the perfect Administration of this Office must be attributed unto *Jesus*. For no man hath seen God at any time; the only-begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him. He gave unto the Apostles the words which his Father gave him. Therefore he hath revealed the perfect will of God. The Confirmation of this Doctrine cannot be denied him, who lived a most innocent and holy life to persuade it, for he did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth; who wrought most powerfull and divine works to confirm it, and was thereby known to be a teacher from God; who died a most painfull and shamefull death to ratifie it, witnessing a good profession before Pontius Pilate; which in it self unto that purpose efficacious, was made more evidently operative in the raising of himself from death. The Propagation and perpetual succession of this Doctrine must likewise be attributed unto *Jesus*, as to no temporary or accidentall Prophet, but as to him who instituted and instructed all who have any relation to that Function. For the Spirit of Christ was in the Prophets: and when he ascended up on high, he gave gifts unto men. For he gave some Apostles, and some Prophets, and some Pastours and Teachers; for the perfecting of the Saints, for the work of the Ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ. It is then most apparent that *Jesus* was so far Christ, as that he was anointed to the Prophetical Office, because his Preparation for that Office was most remarkable, his Mission unto that Office was undeniable, his Administration of that Office was infallible.

Now as *Jesus* was anointed with the Unction of *Elizens* to the Prophetical, so was he also with the Unction of *Aaron* to the Sacerdotal Office. Not that he was called after the Order of *Aaron*; for it is evident that our Lord sprang out of *Judah*, of which tribe *Moses* spake nothing concerning priesthood: but after a more ancient Order, according to the prediction of the Psalmist, The Lord hath sworn, and will not repent, Thou art a Priest for ever after the order of *Melebizedek*. But though he were of another Order, yet whatsoever *Aaron* did as a Priest was wholly typical, and consequently to be fulfilled by the *Messias*, as he was a Priest. For the Priesthood did not begin in *Aaron*, but was translated and conferred upon his family before his consecration. We reade of the Priests which came near the Lord; of young men of the children of *Israel* which offered burnt-offerings, and sacrificed peace-offerings of oxen unto the Lord: which without question were no other then the first-born, to whom the Priesthood did belong. *Jesus* therefore, as the first-begotten of God, was by right a Priest, and being anointed unto that Office, performed every function, by way of Oblation, Intercession and Benediction. Every high priest is ordained to offer gifts and sacrifices: wherefore it is of necessity that this man, *Jesus*, if he be an High Priest, have somewhat also to offer. Not that he had any thing beside himself, or that there was any peculiar Sacrifice allowed to this Priest; to whom, when he cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldst not, but a body hast thou prepared me: and, by the offering of this body of *Jesus Christ* are we sanctified. For he who is our Priest hath given himself an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savour.

Now when *Jesus* had thus given himself a propitiatory Sacrifice for sin, he ascended up on high, and entred into the Holy of holies not made with hands, and there appeared before God as an atonement for our sin. Nor is he prevalent onely in his own oblation once offered, but in his constant Intercession. Who is he that condemneth? saith the Apostle: it is Christ that died, yea rather that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession

Johs 1. 12.
Johs 17.
8, 14.

1 Pet. 2. 22.

Johs 3. 2.

1 Tim. 6. 13.

1 Pet. 1. 11.

Eph. 4. 8, 11, 12.

^a Heb. 7. 14.

21.

^b Ex. 19. 22.

^c Ex. 24. 5.

^d For the Hebrew

נָעַר; signifying ju-

venes, by all

the Translators

is rendered

נָעַר, that

is, primogeni-

ni: and so the

Arabick and Persian

Translations.

^e Heb. 8. 3.

^f Heb. 10. 5.

^g Heb. 10. 10.

^h Eph. 5. 2.

Unus ipse

erat qui of-

ferebat, &

quod offere-

bat. S. Aug.

Unum cum

illo manebat

cui offerebat,

unum in se

fecit pro qui-

bus offere-

bat; unus

ipse erat qui

offerebat, &

quod offere-

bat. Id. de

trinit.

Rom. 8. 34:

from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion. Then he, whose name Rev. 19. 13, 16. is called the word of God, had on his vesture and on his thigh a name written, King of kings, and Lord of lords.

This Regal Office of our Saviour consisteth partly in the ruling, protecting and rewarding of his people; partly in the coercing, condemning and destroying of his enemies. First, he ruleth in his own people, by delivering them a Law, by which they walk; by furnishing them with his grace, by which they are enabled to walk in it. Secondly, he protecteth the same, by helping them to subdue their lusts, which reign in their mortal bodies; by preserving them from the temptations of the world, the flesh and the Devil; by supporting them in all their afflictions; by delivering them from all their enemies. Thirdly, whom he thus rules and protects here he rewards hereafter in a most royal manner, making them *Kings and Priests unto God and his Father*. On the contrary, he sheweth his Regal dominion in the destruction of his enemies, whether they were temporal or spiritual enemies. Temporal, as the *Jews and Romans*, who joined together in his Crucifixion. While he was on earth he told his Disciples, *There be some standing here which shall not taste of death till they see the Son of man coming in his Kingdome*: and in that Kingdome he was then seen to come, when he brought utter destruction on the *Jews* by the *Roman Armies*, not long after to be destroyed themselves. But beside these visible enemies, there are other spiritual, those which hinder the bringing in of his own people into his Father's Kingdome, those which refuse to be subject unto him, and consequently deny him to be their King; as all wicked and ungodly men, of whom he hath said, *These mine enemies, which would not that I should reign over them, bring hither, and slay them before me*. Thus Sin, Satan and Death, being the enemies to his Kingdom, shall all be destroyed in their order. *For he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet: and the last enemy that shall be destroyed is death*. Thus is our *Jesus* become the *Prince of the Kings of the earth*; thus is the *Lamb* acknowledged to be *Lord of lords, and King of kings*. Rev. 1. 6. Matt. 16. 28. Luke 19. 27. 1 Cor. 15. 25, 26. Rev. 1. 5. and 17. 14.

Wherefore seeing we have already shewed that the Prophetical, Sacerdotal and Regal Offices were to belong unto the promised *Messias*, as the proper end and immediate effect of his Unction; seeing we have likewise declared how *Jesus* was anointed to these Offices, and hath and doth actually perform the same in all the Functions belonging to them: there remaineth nothing for the full explication of this particular concerning the *Christ*, but only to shew the manner of this Unction, which is very necessary to be explained. For how they were anointed under the Law who were the types of the *Messias* is plain and evident, because the manner was prescribed, and the materials were visible: God appointed an Oyl to be made, and appropriated it to that use; and the pouring that Oyl upon the body of any person was his anointing to that Office for which he was designed. But being that Oyl so appropriated to this use was lost many hundred years before our Saviour's birth, being the custome of anointing in this manner had a long time ceased, being howsoever we never read that *Jesus* was at all anointed with Oyl; it remaineth still worthy our enquiry, how he was anointed, so as to answer to the former Unctions; and what it was which answered to that Oyl, which then was lost, and was at the first but as a Type of this which now we search for.

The * *Jews* tell us, that the anointing Oyl was hid in the days of *Josiah*, and

of the *Messias* God will restore unto his people the oyl of unction which *Moses* made, which was hidden with the Ark; and the Kings and High Priests shall be anointed with it in those days. *Abarbanel Comment. ad 30. Exod.* Now the loss of that oyl, which they call the hiding of it, may well be thought to foretell the period of the *Mosaical Administration*, being they confess that after that they never had any Priests anointed, because they had no power to make the same oyl. So plainly confesseth the same *Abarbanel*: *למה היה בזה משוח בבית שני לפי שכבר היה נגנו שמן המשחה שננו יאשיהו עם שאר הדברים הקדושים ולא היה להם רשות לעשותה* that

* בימות
המשח
עתי
הקדוש
בית הוה
להחיות
לעמו
אותו שמן
המשחה
שעשה
משה
שננו עם
הארון ובו
ימשה
המלכים
והכהנים
הגדולים
בימי ההם

In the days

that it shall be found and produced again when the *Messias* comes, that he may be anointed with it, and the Kings and High Priests of his days. But though the loss of that Oyl bespoke the destruction of that Nation, yet the *Christ* which was to come needed no such unction for his Consecration; there being as great a difference between the Typicall and correspondent Oyl, as between the representing and represented *Christ*. The Prophet *David* calleth it not by the vulgar name of Oyl of unction, but the ^a *oyl of gladness*. For though that place may in the first sense be understood of *Solomon*, whom when *Zadoc* the Priest anointed, ^b *they blew the Trumpet, and all the people said, God save king Solomon. And all the people came up after him, and the people piped with pipes, and rejoiced with great joy, so that the earth rent with the sound of them*; though from thence it might be said of him, *Thy God hath anointed thee with the oyl of gladness above thy fellows*: yet being those words are spoken unto God, as well as of God, (^{*} *therefore God, thy God,*) the Oyl with which that God is anointed must in the ultimate and highest sense signifie a far greater gladness than that at *Solomon's* Coronation was, even the fountain of all joy and felicity in the Church of God.

^a Psal. 45. 7.

^b 1 King. 1. 39, 40.

^{*} Duas personas, ejus qui unctus est Dei, & qui unxit, intellige. Unde & Aquila Elohim

ὁ ἁγίος
verbum Hebraicum non nominativo casu, sed vocativo, interpretatur, dicens *Dei* & nos propter intelligentiam *Dei* posuimus, quod Latina lingua non accipit, ne quis perverse putet Deum dilecti & amantissimi & regis his Patrem nominari.
S. Hieron. Epist. 104. Quod sequitur, *Unxit te, Deus, Deus tuus*, primum nomen Dei

The † *Ancients* tell us that this Oyl is the Divinity it self, and in the language of the Scriptures it is the Holy Ghost. *S. Peter* teacheth us *how God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power*. Now though there can be no question but the Spirit is the Oyl, yet there is some doubt, when *Jesus* was anointed with it. For we know the Angel said unto the blessed Virgin, ^c *The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God*. From whence it appeareth that from the Conception, or at the Incarnation, *Jesus* was sanctified by the Holy Ghost, and the power of the Highest; and so consequently, as *S. Peter* spake, he was ^{*} *anointed then with the Holy Ghost and with power*. Again, being we read that after he was thirty years of age, the Spirit like a Dove descended and lighted upon him, and he, descending in the power of the Spirit into *Galilee*, said unto them of *Nazareth*, *This day is this Scripture fulfilled in your ears*, meaning that of *Isaiah*, *The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the Gospel*; hence † hath it been also collected, that his Unction was performed at his Baptism. Nor need we to contend which of these two was the true time of our Saviour's Unction, since neither is destructive of the other, and consequently both may well consist together. *David*, the most undoubted type of the *Messiah*, was anointed at *Bethlehem*; for there ^d *Samuel took the horn of oyl, and anointed him in the midst of his brethren: and the Spirit of the Lord came upon David from that day forward*. Of which unction those words of God must necessarily be understood, ^e *I have found David my servant; with my holy oyl have I anoin-*

vocativo casu intelligendum est, sequens nominativo: quod satis miror cur Aquila non, ut ceperat in primo versiculo, vocativo casu interpretatus sit, sed nominativo, his nominans Deum qui supradictum unxit Deum. *Id. id.* † *S. Greg. Naz.* exponens the place: "Ὁν ἔχειον ἑαυτον ἀγαλλιάσας παρὰ τὸς μετόχους αὐτοῦ, χρίσας τὸν ἀνθρώπινον τῇ δυνάμει, ὡς πάλαι τὸ ἀμφοτέρωθεν. And again, *Χρίσας ὃ δὴ τὸν δυνάμει*, (not that his Divinity was anointed, or *Christ* anointed in respect of his Divinity; but that he was anointed in his Humanity by his Divinity) *χρίσας ὃ αὐτὸν τῇ ἀνθρώπινῃ ἐν ἐνέργειᾳ, καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν χρίσας, ἀγαλλιάσας, παρὰ τὸς μετόχους, ὡς τὸν χρίσας, ὃς ἔργον ἀνθρώπων ἀκούει τὸ χρίον, καὶ πάλαι δὲ τὸ χρίον.* *Orat. 2. de Filio.* ^c *Luc. 1. 35.* * *Χρίσας ἑαυτὸν ὡς βασιλεὺς καὶ ἱερεὺς τοῦ χρίσματος τῆς σαρκώσεως.* *Germanus Constant. Kερίσας ὃ ὡς ἱερεὺς ἐαυτὸν τὸν ὡς, ὃ ἐπὶ τῇ σαρκὶ ἡρώδων δυνάμει καὶ ἡμῶν, καὶ ἐν ἀνθρώπινον.* *Titus Boetius.* Deus est qui ungit, & Deus qui secundum carnem ungitur Dei filius. Denique quos habet unctionis suae *Christus* nisi in carne participes? Vides igitur quia Deus à Deo unctus, sed in assumptione naturae unctus humanae Dei filius designatur. *S. Ambros. de Fide, l. 1. c. 2.* Haec omnia carni conveniunt, cum piissimum & gloriosissimum verbum unum est pro salute cunctorum. *Cassiodorus in Psal. 44.* † *S. Hieron.* mentioning that place of the Psalm, Quando conjortes nominantur, naturam carnis intellige, quia Deus conjortes substantiae suae non habet. Et quia erat unctio spiritualis & nequaquam humani corporis, (ut fuit in sacerdotibus Judaeorum) adcirco praeter confortibus, id est, ceteris sanctis, unctus esse memoratur. Cujus unctio illo expleta est tempore quando baptizatus est in Jordane, & Spiritus Sanctus in specie columbae descendit super eum, & mansit in illo. *Comment. in Ezechiam, c. 6.* In illa columba quae super ipsum post baptismum descendit, cum sacramento Baptismatis, & veri sacerdotii jura suscepit, fuso videlicet super eum oleo exaltationis, de quo Psalmista canit; Unxit te, inquit, Deus, Deus tuus. *Petrus Damianus, Cyprianus, 6. c. 4.*

^d 1 Sam. 16. 13. ^e Psal. 89. 20.

ted him. And yet he was again anointed at Hebron; first over the house of ^{2 Sam. 2.} Judah, then over all the tribes of Israel. As therefore David at his first Unction received the Spirit of God, and a full right unto the Throne of Israel, which yet he was not to exercise till the death of Saul and acceptance of the Tribes; and therefore when the time was come that he should actually enter upon his Regal Office, he was again anointed: So our Jesus, the Son of David, was first sanctified and anointed with the Holy Ghost at his Conception, and thereby received a right unto, and was prepared for, all those Offices which belonged to the Redeemer of the world; but when he was to enter upon the actual and full performance of all those Functions which belonged to him, then doth the same Spirit which had sanctified him at his Conception visibly descend upon him at his Inauguration. And that most properly upon his Baptism, because, according to the customs of those ancient nations, washing was wont to *precede their Unctions: wherefore ^{4. and 5. 3.} Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway out of the water: and lo, the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a Dove. As David sent Solomon to be anointed at Gihon: from whence arose that ancient observation of the Rab- bins, that † Kings were not be anointed but by a fountain.

* As appears by those entertainments so frequently mentioned by Homer in his *Odyssey*: as when Telemachus

thus is entertained by Nestor; Τηλέμαχον λῶσαν καλῇ Πολυγένη, Νέστορ ὁ ἐμπότατι θυγάτηρ Νηληϊάδαο. Αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα λῶσέν τε καὶ ἔχευεν λίπ' ἑλαιῷ. *Od. Γ.* And Telemachus and Pisistratus are invited to the Court of Menelaus;

Ἐς δ' ἀσπιδόεντος βάντες εὐχέσθους λῶσαντο.

Τὸς δ' ἔπειτα δμῶα λῶσαν καὶ χρίσαν ἑλαιῷ. *Od. Δ.*

Thus *Ulysses* is entertained, *Od. Θ.* thus *Pyrrhus* and *Telemachus*, *Od. Ρ.* and *Venus*, returning to *Paphos*, is so ordered by the *Charites*;

Ἐνθα δὲ μιν χέειντες λῶσαν καὶ χρίσαν ἑλαιῷ

Ἀμύροισα, οἷα θεὸς ἐπινύσσειν αἰὲν ἑόρτας. *Od. Θ.*

So *Helena* speaks of her entertaining *Ulysses* in a disguise;

Ἄλλ' ὅτε δὲ μιν ἔβαν ἑλὸδον καὶ χρίον ἑλαιῷ.

It is apparent that this was the custom of the ancient Greeks. Of which *Eusebius* gives this reason: Ἐλαιῷ ἐχρίοντο οἱ λαοὶ μὲν ἑμπόδοντες τοῦ (ωματικῆς πόρος, ὡς ἀνὰ μετὰ λυγρὸν εἴποιεν τὴν ὑγρότητα. This custom was so ancient and general, that the Greeks had one word to express this anointing with oil after washing with water, which they called χύτλα, and χυτλάσαι. *Etymol. χυτλάσαι, ἔχ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀλείψαι, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἐπὶ λυγρῷ ἀλείψαι.* *Schol. Aristoph.* χύτλα ὃ κυεῖται, τὸ ὑγρὸν ἐπὶ ὑδατὶ ὄντ' ὅτ' οὐ μὲν ἀλείψαι. *Heijch.* χύτλα, τὸ ἐφ' ὑδατὶ ἔλαιον, and χυτλάσαι, τὸ ἀλείψαι μετὰ τὸ λῶσαι. Hence, when *Nausicaa* went unto the pools to wash, her mother gave her a box of oil, *Od. Ζ.*

Δόξα δ' ἔχουσιν ἐν λυγρῷ ὑγρὸν ἔλαιον,

εἷως χυτλάσαιτο σὺν ἀμφιπόλοισι γυναιξίν.

where the old Scholiast, χυτλάσαιτο, λουμένη ἀλείψαιτο and *Eusebius*, εἷως χυτλάσαιτο, ἀπὸ τοῦ, ὅπως μετὰ λυγρὸν χυτλάσαι ἀλείψαι. which exposition is warranted by the performance after mentioned,

Αἱ δ' ἰσοσάμηναι καὶ ἀλείψαι λίπ' ἑλαιῷ.

And as this was the ancient custom of the Greeks, so was it also the common custom of the Jews, as appears by the words of *Naomi* to *Ruth*, Wash thy self therefore, and anoint thee, and put thy raiment upon thee. *Ruth. 3. 3.* *Mat. 23. 16.* They say in the Gemara, that this is a Maxime of the Doctours, וְיָשְׁחוּ אֶת הַמְּלָכִים אֶת כָּל מַלְכֵי הַבָּשָׁר בְּשֶׁן הַבַּיִת. *Barabael* in 30. *Exod.* The end of which ceremony was to shew the prolonging of his kingdom who was so anointed; and the original is referred to the anointing of *Solomon* 1 *King. 1. 33.* For so it followeth in the Talmud, כִּי שְׁתִּימַשְׁךָ מַלְכוּתָא שְׁנֵי יוֹדֵי, וְהָיָה אִתְּךָ אֶבֶן. *Abbarabael* *ibid.*

Now as we have shewed that Jesus was anointed with the Holy Ghost, lest any should deny any such descension to be a proper or sufficient Unction, we shall farther make it appear, that the Effusion, or Action of the Spirit, eminently containeth whatsoever the Jews have imagined to be performed or signified by those legal Anointings. Two very good reasons they render why God did command the use of such anointing Oyl, as in respect of the action. First, that it might signifie the Divine election of that person, and designation to that Office: from whence it was necessary that it should be performed by a Prophet, who understood the will of God. Secondly, that by it the person anointed might be made fit to receive the Divine influx. For the first, it is evident there could be no such infallible sign of the Divine designation of Jesus to his Offices, as the visible descent of the Spirit, attended with a voice from ^{Matt. 3. 17.} heaven, in stead of the hand of a Prophet, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased. For the second, this spiritual Unction was so far from giving less than an aptitude to receive the Divine influx, that it was

that divine Influx, nay, the Divinity it self, the Godhead dwelling in him bodily.

In respect of the matter, they give two causes why it was Oyl, and not any other liquour. First, because of all other it signifies the greatest glory and excellency. The Olive was the first of Trees mentioned as fit for Sovereignty, in regard of its *fatness, wherewith they honour God and man*. Therefore it was fit that those persons which were called to a greater dignity then the rest of the *Jews* should be consecrated by Oyl, as the best sign of election to Honour. And can there be a greater honour then to be the Son of God, the *beloved Son*, as *Jesus* was proclaimed at this Unction, by which he was consecrated to such an Office as will obtain him a Name far above all names? Secondly, they tell us that Oyl continueth uncorrupted longer then any other liquour. And indeed it hath been observed to preserve not onely it self, but † other things, from corruption. Hence they conclude it fit, their Kings and Priests, whose succession was to continue for ever, should be anointed with Oyl, the most proper embleme of Eternity. But even by this reason of their own their Unction is ceased, being the succession of their Kings and Priests is long since cut off, and their eternal and eternizing Oyl lost long before. And onely that one *Jesus*, who was anointed with the most spiritual Oyl, ^a *continueth for ever*; and therefore *hath an unchangeable Priesthood*, as being made not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life.

† Unguenta optime servantur in alabastris, odores in oleo. *Plin. Hist.*

l. 13. c. 2.

Existimatur & ebori vindicando a carie utile esse. Certe simulacrum Saturni Romæ

ineus oleo repletum est. *Id. l. 15. c. 7.* And whosoever made that Statue at Rome, seems to have had his Art out of Greece, from that famous Ivory Statue made by Phidias. Οὗτος γὰρ μὲν τὸ καλῶς ἀδράσει Πιστῶν ἠδὲ λαῶν, (ἐξ ἐλεφαντίνου ὅτι πτωχῶν) ἔλασαν ἐκ γυναικὸς σεβαστῆς ἐν ἀμφοτέρω τοῦ πόδα, ἐμπεριέειν τὰ ἀγάλματα, ἀπὸ λαῶν εἰς δωμάτων εὐλασίαν αὐτῶν. *Proclus apud Epiphani. Har. 64. §. 18.* * *Heb. 7. 24, 16.*

Beside, they observe, that simple Oyl without any mixture was sufficient for the Candlestick; but that which was designed for Unction must be compounded with principal Spices, which signifie a good name, always to be acquired by those in places of greatest dignity by the most laudable and honourable actions. And certainly never was such an admixture of Spices as in the Unction of our Saviour, by which he was endued with all variety of the Graces of God, by which he was enabled to offer himself a sacrifice for a sweet-smelling savour. For as ^b *he was full of grace and truth*; so of his fulness have we all received, grace for grace: and as we ^c *have received anointing of him*; so we ^d *are unto God a sweet savour of Christ*.

* *Job. 1. 14, 16.*

* *1 Job. 2. 27.*

* *2 Cor. 2. 15.*

Again, it was sufficient to anoint the Vessels of the Sanctuary in any part; but it was particularly commanded that the Oyl should be poured upon the Head of the Kings and Priests, as the seat of all the animal Faculties, the fountain of all Dignity, and * original of all the members of the body. This was more eminently fulfilled in *Jesus*, who by his Unction, or as *Christ*, became the head of the Church; nay, the ^e *head of all principality and power, from which all the body by joints and bands having nourishment ministered, and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God*.

* According to the Etymology in the Hebrew Language, of which Abanabel here takes notice; וְלֵכֶן נִקְרָא רֹאשׁוֹ וְלֵכֶן נִקְרָא רֹאשׁוֹ לְכָל אֲגָבֵי וְיִדְיוֹ מֵעוֹלָם שְׁמוֹ.

וְלֵכֶן נִקְרָא רֹאשׁוֹ לְכָל אֲגָבֵי וְיִדְיוֹ מֵעוֹלָם שְׁמוֹ.

* *Col. 2. 10, 19.*

* *Lev. 8. 12.*

Lastly, they observe, that though in the Vessels nothing but a single Unction was required; yet in the Kings and Priests there was commanded, or at least practised, both Unction and Affusion, (as it is written, ^f *He poured of the anointing oyl upon Aaron's head, and anointed him to sanctify him*;) the first to signifie their Separation, the second to assure them of the falling of the Spirit upon them. Now what more clear then that our *Christ* was anointed by Affusion, whether we look upon his Conception, the *Holy Ghost shall come upon thee*; or his Inauguration, the *Spirit descended and lighted upon him*? And thus, according unto all particulars required by the *Jews* themselves to compleat their legal Unctions, we have sufficiently shewed that *Jesus* was, as most eminently, so most properly, anointed with the Spirit of God.

Where-

Wherefore being we have shewn that a *Messias* was to come into the World; being we have proved that he is already come, by the same predictions by which we believe he was to come; being we have demonstrated that *Jesus* born in the days of *Herod* was and is that promised *Messias*; being we have farther declared that he was anointed to those Offices which belonged to the *Messias*, and actually did and doth still perform them all; and that his anointing was by the immediate effusion of the Spirit, which answereth fully to all things required in the Legal and Typical Unction: I cannot see what farther can be expected for explication or confirmation of this Truth, that *Jesus is the Christ*.

The necessity of believing this part of the Article is most apparent, because it were impossible he should be our *Jesus*, except he were *the Christ*. For he could not reveal the way of Salvation, except he were a Prophet; he could not work out that Salvation revealed, except he were a Priest; he could not confer that Salvation upon us, except he were a King; he could not be Prophet, Priest, and King, except he were *the Christ*. This was the fundamental doctrine which the Apostles not only testified, as they did that of the Resurrection, but argued, proved, and demonstrated out of the Law and the Prophets. We find *S. Paul* at *Thessalonica* three Sabbath-days reasoning with them out of the Scriptures, opening and alledging that *Christ* must needs have suffered, and risen again from the dead; and that this *Jesus* whom I preach unto you, is *Christ*. *Acts 17. 2, 3.* We find him again at *Corinth* pressed in spirit, and testifying to the Jews, that *Jesus* was *Christ*. *Ch. 18. 5.* Thus *Apollos*, by birth a Jew, but instructed in the Christian Faith by *Aquila* and *Priscilla*, mightily convinced the Jews, and that publickly, shewing by the Scriptures, that *Jesus* was *Christ*. *Vers. 28.* This was the Touchstone by which all men at first were tried whether they were Christian or Antichristian. For whosoever believeth, saith *S. John*, that *Jesus is the Christ*, is born of God. What greater commendation of the assertion of this Truth? Who is a liar, saith the same Apostle, but he that denieth that *Jesus is the Christ*? This man is the Antichrist, as denying the Father and the Son. What higher condemnation of the negation of it?

Secondly, as it is necessary to be believed as a most fundamental Truth, so it hath as necessary an influence upon our conversations; because except it hath so, it cannot clearly be maintained. Nothing can be more absurd in a disputant, then to pretend to demonstrate a Truth as infallible, and at the same time to shew it impossible. And yet so doth every one who professeth Faith in *Christ* already come, and liveth not according to that profession: for thereby he proveth, as far as he is able, that the true *Christ* is not yet come, at least that *Jesus* is not he. We sufficiently demonstrate to the Jews that our Saviour, who did and suffered so much, is the true *Messias*; but by our lives we recall our arguments, and strengthen their wilfull opposition. For there was certainly a Promise, that when *Christ* should come, the wolf should dwell with the lamb, and the leopard should lie down with the kid, and the calf and the young lion and the fatling together, and a little child should lead them; that is, there should be so much love, unanimity and brotherly kindness in the Kingdom of *Christ*, that all ferity and inhumanity being laid aside, the most different natures and inclinations should come to the sweetest harmony and agreement. Whereas if we look upon our selves, we must confess there was never more bitterness of spirit, more rancour of malice, more heat of contention, more manifest symptoms of envy, hatred, and all uncharitableness, then in those which make profession of the Christian Faith. It was infallibly foretold, that when the law should go forth out of *Zion*, and the word of the Lord from *Jerusalem*, they should beat their swords into plough-shares, and their spears into

into pruning-hooks: nation should not lift up sword against nation, neither should they learn war any more. Whereas there is no other Art so much studied, so much applauded, so violently asserted, not onely as lawfull, but as necessary. Look upon the face of Christendome divided into severall Kingdoms and Principalities; what are all these but so many publick Enemies, either exercising or designing War? The Church was not more famous, or did more encrease, by the first blood which was shed in the Primitive times through the external violence of ten Persecutions, then now 'tis infamous, and declines, through constant violence, fraud and rapine, through publick engagements of the greatest Empires in Arms, through civil and intestine Wars, and, lest any way of shedding Christian blood should be unassayed, even by Massacres. It was likewise prophesied of the dayes of the *Messias*, that all Idolatry should totally cease, that all false Teachers should be cut off, and unclean spirits restrained. And can we think that the *Jews*, who really abhor the thoughts of worshipping an Image, can ever be persuaded there is no Idolatry committed in the Christian Church? Or can we excuse our selves in the least degree from the plague of the Locusts of *Agypt*, the false Teachers? Can so many Schisms and Sects arise, and spread, can so many Heresies be acknowledged and countenanced, without false Prophets and unclean spirits? If then we would return to the bond of true Christian Love and Charity, if we would appear true lovers of Peace and Tranquillity, if we would truly hate the abominations of Idolatry, false Doctrine and Heresie, let us often remember what we ever profess in our Creed, that *Jesus* is the *Christ*, that the Kingdom of the *Messias* cannot consist with these Impieties.

Thirdly, the necessity of this Belief appeareth in respect of those Offices which belong to *Jesus* as he is the *Christ*. We must look upon him as upon the Prophet anointed by God to preach the Gospel, that we may be incited to hear and embrace his Doctrine. Though *Moses* and *Elias* be together with him in the Mount, yet the Voice from Heaven speaketh of none but *Jesus*, *Hear ye him.* He is that Wisdom, the *delight of God*, crying in the *Proverbs*, *Blessed is the man that heareth me, watching daily at my gates, waiting at the posts of my doors.* There is one thing needfull, saith our Saviour; and *Mary* chose that good part, who sate at *Jesus* feet, and heard his word. Which devout posture teacheth us, as a willingness to hear, so a readiness to obey: and the proper effect which the belief of this Propheticall Office worketh in us is our *Obedience of Faith*. We must farther consider him as our High-priest, that we may thereby adde Confidence to that Obedience. For we have *boldness to enter into the Holiest by the blood of Jesus*; yea, *having an High-priest over the house of God, we may draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith.* And as this breedeth an adherence and assurance in us, so it requireth a resignation of us. For if *Christ* have redeemed us, we are his; if he died for us, it was that we should live to him: if we be *bought with a price*, we are no longer our own; but we must *glorifie God in our body and in our spirit, which are God's.* Again, an apprehension of him as a King is necessary for the performance of our true and entire allegiance to him. *Send the lamb of the Ruler of the earth*, doe him homage, acknowledge him your King, shew your selves faithfull and obedient subjects. We can pretend, and he hath required, no less. As soon as he let the Apostles understand that *All power was given unto him in heaven and in earth*, he charged them to *teach all nations, to observe all things whatsoever he commanded them.* Can we imagine he should so strictly injoyne subjection to *higher powers*, the highest of whom are here below, and that he doth not expect exact obedience to him who is exalted far above all principalities and powers, and is set down at the right hand of God? It is observable, that in the

Descri-

Zach. 13. 2.

Matth. 17. 5.

Prov. 8. 34.

Luke 10. 42.
39.

Heb. 10. 19,
21, 22.

1 Cor. 6. 20.

Isa. 16. 1.

Matth. 28. 18,
20.

Fourthly, the belief of *Jesus the Christ* is necessary to instruct us what it is to be a Christian, and how far we stand obliged by owning that name. Those who did first embrace the Faith were styled * *Disciples*, (as when *the number of Disciples was multiplied*,) or *Believers*, or *Brethren*, or † *men of the Church*, or *Callers upon the name of Christ*, or † *men of the way*; or, by their Enemies, *Nazarens*, and *Galileans*. But in a short time they gained a Name derived from their Saviour, though not from that name of his which signifieth Salvation; for from *Christ* they were called *Christians*. A Title so honourable, and of such concernment, that S. *Luke* hath thought fit to mention the City in which that name first was heard. + *And the Disciples were called Christians first at Antioch*, as the Scriptures assure us; so named by *Euodius* the Bishop of that place, as Ecclesiasticall History informs us. A name no sooner invented, but embraced by all Believers, as bearing the most proper signification of their Profession, and relation to the Authour and Master whom they served. In which the Primitive Christians so much delighted, that before the face of their enemies they would acknowledge * no other Title but that, though hated, reviled, tormented, martyred for it. Nor is this Name of greater honour to us, then obligation. There are two parts of the Seal of the foundation of God, and one of them is this, ^a *Let every one that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquity*. It was a common answer of the ancient Martyrs, † *I am a Christian, and with us no evil is done*. The very name was thought to speak something

[illegible]

αἰορίσ. Thus then, in the language of the Scriptures, μαθητήν πναι is to make a Disciple; as μαθητεύσας ἰσάβας, Acts 14. 21. μαθητήν πναι, to be a Disciple; as Joseph of Arimathæa ἐμαθήυσσε τὸ Ἰσὺν, Matt. 27. 57. μαθητευθῆναι the same; as γραμματεὺς μαθηπυθεῖς εἰς τὸ βασιλεῖον τοῦ θεοῦ, Matt. 13. 52. Τὴν μαθητευθῆναι τὸ Κεῖναι, is often used by S. Basil the Great, whose title is, Ὁ πρὸς τὸν μαθητευθῆναι τὸ Κεῖναι, καὶ τότε ἐκταξιωθῆναι τὸ ἀπὸ βασιλείας, according to our Saviour's method. Hence those which were first converted to the Faith were called μαθηταί, as the Disciples of Christ their Doctor and Master. † Οἱ δὲ τὸν τὸ ἐκκλησίαν, as when Herod stretched forth his hand κατὰ κράτος τοῦ τοῦ τὸ ἐκκλησίας, to mischief some of those which were of the Church. ¶ As when Saul went down to Damascus with a commission, ὅπως εἰάν πνας εὐρεῖ τὸ δὲ δὲ ὄντας, ἀνδράς τε καὶ γυναῖκας, δεδεσμένους ἀπὸ χειρὸς Ἰερουσαλὴμ, Acts 9. 2. we translate it, any of this way, when there was no way mentioned to which the Pronoun this should have relation; nor is ἡ δὲ in Greek any more than the way. So when S. Paul went to the Synagogue at Corinth, divers were hardened and believed not, κακολογούσας τὸ δὲ δὲ ἐν ὁσόντων τὸ πλῆθος, Acts 19. 9. here we translate it, spoke evil of that way; but Beza has left his Articulus pronominis vice fungitur, which he had from Erasmus, and hath otherwise supplied it, male loquentes de via Dei: and the Old Translation, which in the former had hujus vice, in this hath simply maledicentes vice, and certainly ἡ δὲ is nothing but the way. Again, at Ephesus, ἐβρίετο ὃ καὶ τὸν καθεὶν σκῆνον τὸ ἐκ-
χ- ὁ ἐκ δὲ τοῦ τοῦ δὲ δὲ, Acts 19. 23. de via, V. Transl. Beza again ob viam Dei, but it is nothing but, the way. Thus Felix put off S. Paul, ἀπὸ τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ τοῦ δὲ δὲ, till he had a more exact knowledge of the way. V. Transl. de via hac; Beza, ad scitum istam. Whereas then the phrase is so simple and so frequently the same, it can be nothing else but the word then in use to signify the Religion

Legion which the Christians professed. And so some also of the Ancients seem to have spoken, as appears by the Language of the Adelphe-
 decians, *Χριστός ἐξελήνθη, ἡμᾶς καθύπερθε πολλῶν ὁδῶν εἰς μίαν ταύτην τὴν γνῶσιν, ἐπειδὴν ἀπέστειλεν ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ ἡδύλων, καὶ
 ὑποδύξαν ἡμῶν τὸ ὄδον.* and that in the description of the Gallican Persecution, *Ἐμεῖς τὴν ἑξῆς οἱ μὲν δὲ ἰσχυρὸς πόμπη πείρας, καὶ
 μὲν δὲ ἀδύστην ἐν δυνάμει τυμφικῇ, μὲν δὲ ἐννοίᾳ ὁδοῦ Θεοῦ ὁρμήας· ἀλλὰ καὶ διὰ τὴν ἀναστροφὴν αὐτῶν βλασφημίες τὸ ὄδον.* *Ensch. Hist. l. 5. c. 1.*

+ S. Luke noteth the place, but neither the time when nor person by whom this name was given. Tertullian seems
 to make it as ancient as the reign of Tiberius, *Apolog. c. 5.* Tiberius ergo, cujus tempore nomen Christianum in seculum introivit.
 But I conceive indeed he speaks not of the name, but of the Religion: for so he may well be thought to expound himself, saying soon after,
Census istius disciplinae, ut jam edidimus, à Tiberio est. c. 7. However, the name of Christian is not so ancient as Tiberius, nor, as I
 think, as Caius. Some ancient Authour in Suidas assures us, that it was first named in the reign of Claudius, when S. Peter had or-
 dained Euxodius Bishop of Antioch. *Ἰστέον ὅτι ἐπὶ Κλαυδίου βασιλέως Ρώμης, Πέτρου τῷ ἀποστόλῳ χειροτονήσαντι Εὐδόκιον, μὲν
 ἀνομάσαντος οἱ πάλαι λεγόμενοι Ναζηραῖοι καὶ Γαλιλαῖοι, Χριστιανοί. Suid. in Ναζηραῖοι and in Χριστιανοί. And Johannes Au-
 tiocchenus confirms not only the time, but tells us that Euxodius the Bishop was the authour of the name. Καὶ ἐπὶ αὐτοῦ (Κλαυδίου) Χρι-
 στιανοὶ ἀνομάσαντες, τὸ αὐτὸ ἐπισκόπου Εὐδοκίου χειροτονήσαντι αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐπιθήσαντι αὐτοῖς τὸ ὄνομα τούτο· πρὸς τὸν καὶ Ναζα-
 ραῖοι καὶ Γαλιλαῖοι ἐκαθάρθησαν οἱ Χριστιανοί. Thus the name of Christian was first brought into use at Antioch, by Euxodius the Bishop of
 the place, and hath ever since been continued as the most proper appellation which could be given unto our Profession, being derived from
 the authour and finisher of our Faith. At nunc Secta oditur in nomine utique sui autoris. Quid novi si aliqua disciplina de Ma-
 gistro cognomenum sectatoribus suis inducit? Nonne Philosophi de autoribus suis nuncupantur Platonici, Epicurei, Pytha-
 gorici? Etiam à locis conventiculorum & stationum suarum Stoici, Academici? Neque Medici ab Erasistrato, & Grammatici
 ab Aristarcho, Coeci etiam ab Apicio? Neque tamen querquam offendit professio nominis cum institutione transmissa ab insti-
 tutore. Tertull. *Apolog. c. 3.**

As we read of Suidas, a Deacon at Vienna, in a hot persecution of the French Church, who,
 being in the midst of tortures, was troubled with several questions, which the Gentiles usually then asked, to try if they could extort any
 confession of any wicked actions practised secretly by the Christians; yet would not give any other a swer to any question, then that he was
 a Christian. Τούτῳ τῷ παρρησίᾳ ἀντιπαρτάξας αὐτοῖς, ὥς καὶ τὸ ἴδιον καλεῖται ὄνομα, καὶ ἔθνος καὶ πείρας ὡς ἐν λόγῳ,
 καὶ τὸ εἶδός ἐν ἑλευθερίᾳ εἶναι· ἀλλὰ πρὸς πάντα τὰ ἐρωτώμενα ἀπακρίνατο τῇ Ρωμαϊκῇ αὐτῷ, Χριστιανός εἰμι, τούτο καὶ
 ἀπὸ τῶν ὀνομάτων, καὶ ἀπὸ πείρας, καὶ ἀπὸ γένους, καὶ ἀπὸ παντὸς ἐπιδήμιως ἀπολόγηται. *Ensch. Hist. Eccl. l. 5. c. 1.* The same doth S. Chry-
 sostome testify of S. Lucian: Πολύαις παρρησίαι· Χριστιανός εἰμι, εἴποι· τί ἔχεις ἐπιτιθέμενα; Χριστιανός εἰμι· τίνας σεβόμενους; ὁ
 Θεός ἀπὸ πάλαι ἐλάττω, ἐπὶ Χριστιανός εἰμι. *2 Tim. 2. 19.*

+ So Blauidius in the French Persecution: *Ἰδὲ αὐτοῖς ἀνδάνηται· καὶ ἀνὰ πᾶσιν καὶ ἀνὰ γένος, καὶ ἀπὸ παντὸς ἐπὶ Χριστιανὸς εἰμι, καὶ περὶ ἡμῶν ὡς ἐν τῷ λόγῳ γίνεσθαι.* *Ensch. Hist. Eccl. l. 5. c. 1.*

+ Alii quos ante hoc nomen vages, viles, improbos noverant, ex ipso denotant quod laudant, cæcitate odii in
 suffragium impingunt. Quæ mulier! quam lasciva! quam festiva! qui juvenis! quam lascivus! quam amatus! facti sunt
 Christiani: ita nomen emendationis imputatur. Tertull.

+ Torum in id revolvitur, ut qui Christiani nominis opus non agit,
 Christianus non esse videatur. Nomen enim sine actu atque officio suo nihil est. Salvian. *de Provid. l. 4.* Ἐάν τις τὸ ὄνομα
 λαβὼν τῷ Χριστιανισμῷ ἐνθεύῃ καὶ Χριστῷ, ὡς ἐν τῷ λόγῳ ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ σεσημασμένος. S. Basil. *ad Amphilocho.*

* Christianus
 vero, quantum interpretatio est, de unctione deducitur. Tertull. *Apolog. c. 3.* *Psal. 133. 2.* † Inde apparet Christi cor-
 pus nos esse, qui omnes unguimur, & omnes in illo & Christi & Christus sumus, quia quodammodo totus Christus caput & cor-
 pus est. S. August. *in Psal. 16.* *2 Cor. 1. 21.* *1 Joh. 2. 20, 27.*

† Τοιοῦτον ἡμῶς τότε εἶνα καὶ ὁμοῦλα Χριστιανός,
 ἐπὶ χρίσμα ἔλαβον Θεοῦ. Theophilus *ad Autol. l. 1.*

Thus having run through all the particulars at first designed for the expli-
 cation of the title *Christ*, we may at last clearly express, and every Christian
 easily understand, what it is we say when we make our Confession in these
 words, *I believe in Jesus Christ*. I do assent unto this as a certain truth, that
 there was a man promised by God, foretold by the Prophets to be the *Mes-
 sias*, the Redeemer of *Israel*, and the expectation of the Nations. I am fully
 assured by all those predictions that the *Messias* so promised is already come.
 I am as certainly persuaded, that the man born in the days of *Herod* of the
Virgin Mary, by an Angel from Heaven called *Jesus*, is that true *Messias*, so
 long, so often promised: that, as the *Messias*, he was anointed to three spe-
 cial Offices, belonging to him as the Mediatour between God and man: that
 he was a Prophet, revealing unto us the whole will of God for the Salvation
 of man; that he was a Priest, and hath given himself a Sacrifice for sin, and so
 hath made an atonement for us; that he is a King, set down at the right hand
 of God, far above all principalities and powers, whereby, when he hath sub-
 dued all our enemies, he will conferr actual, perfect and eternall Happiness
 upon us. I believe this unction by which he became the true *Messias* was not
 performed by any material Oyl, but by the Spirit of God, which he received
 as the Head, and conveyeth to his members. And in this full acknowledgment
I believe in Jesus Christ.

rum, non ex virgine, & in vulva, non ex vulva, quia & Angelus in seminis ad Joseph, Nam quod in ea natum est, inquit, de Sp.S. est. De Carne Christi, c. 19. and of that in S. Luke, Hec & ab Angelo exceperat secundum nostrum Evangelium, Propetia quod in te nascetur vocabitur sanctum, filius Dei. Act. Marcion. l. 4. c. 7. Yet quod in ea natum est cannot be proper, while it is yet in the womb; nor can the child first be said to be born, and then that the mother shall bring it forth. 'Tis true indeed, *γεννᾶν* signifies not always to beget, but sometimes to bear or bring forth; as in *γεννᾶν* (C) *ἐκ τῆς μητρὸς σου* (Coi, Luke 1. 13. and v. 57. *ἐκ τῆς μητρὸς σου*). So τὸ *γεννᾶν* *ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ* (Matt. 2. 1. must necessarily be understood of Christ's nativity, for it is most certain that he was not begotten or conceived at Bethlehem. And this without question must be the meaning of Herod's inquisition, *πῶς ὁ Χριστὸς γεννητῆται*, where the Messias was to be born. But though *γεννᾶν* have sometime the signification of bearing or bringing forth; yet τὸ *γεννᾶν* *ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ* cannot be so interpreted, because it speaks of something as past, whereas yet Christ was not born: and though the conception was already past, and we translate it so, which is conceived; yet S. Basil rejects that interpretation. *γεννᾶν* is one thing, *ἐκ τῆς ἐκκλησίας* another. Seeing then the Nativity was not yet come, and *γεννᾶν* speaks of something already past, therefore the old Translation is not good, quod in ea natum est. Seeing, though the Conception indeed were past, yet *γεννᾶν* signifieth not to conceive, and so is not properly to be interpreted, that which is conceived; seeing *γεννᾶν* is most properly to beget, as in *γεννᾶν* the generative faculty: therefore I conceive the fittest interpretation of those words, τὸ *γεννᾶν* *ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ*, that which is begotten in her. And because the Angel in S. Luke speaks of the same thing, therefore I interpret τὸ *γεννᾶν* *ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ* (C), in the same manner, that which is begotten of thee.

gel to the Virgin; *The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: Therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee (or, which is begotten of thee) shall be called the Son of God.* And the reason is clear, because that the Holy Ghost is God. For were he any Creature, and not God himself, by whom our Saviour was thus born of the Virgin, he must have been the Son of a Creature, not of God.

Secondly, it is as undoubtedly true, that the same Christ, thus born of the Virgin by the Spirit of God, was designed to so high an Office by the special and immediate will of God, that by virtue thereof he must be acknowledged the Son of God. He urgeth this argument himself against the Jews; *Is it not written in your Law, I said, Ye are Gods? Are not these the very words of the eighty second Psalm? If he called them Gods, if God himself so spake, or the Psalmist from him, if this be the language of the Scripture, if they be called Gods unto whom the word of God came, (and the Scripture cannot be broken, nor the authority thereof in any particular denied;) Say ye of him whom the Father hath sanctified and sent into the world, whom he hath consecrated and commissioned to the most eminent and extraordinary Office, say ye of him, Thou blasphemest, because I said, I am the Son of God?*

Thirdly, Christ must therefore be acknowledged the Son of God, because he is raised immediately by God out of the earth unto immortal life. For God hath fulfilled the promise unto us, in that he hath raised up Jesus again; as it is also written in the second Psalm, *Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee.* The grave is as the womb of the earth; Christ, who is raised from thence, is as it were begotten to another life; and God, who raised him, is his Father. So true it must needs be of him, which is spoken of others, who are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection. Thus was he defined, or constituted, and appointed the Son of God with power by the resurrection from the dead: neither is he called simply the first that rose, but with a note of generation, the first-born from the dead.

Fourthly, Christ, after his resurrection from the dead, is made actually heir of all things in his Father's house, and Lord of all the Spirits which minister unto him, from whence he also hath the title of the Son of God. He is set down on the right hand of the Majesty on high; Being made so much better then the Angels, as he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name then they. For unto which of the Angels said he at any time, *Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee?* From all which testimonies of the Scriptures it is evident, that Christ hath this fourfold right unto the Title of the Son of God: by generation, as begotten of God; by commission, as sent by him; by resurrection, as the first-born; by actual possession, as heir of all.

But beside these four, we must find yet a more peculiar ground of our Saviour's Filiation, totally distinct from any which belongs unto the rest of the Sons of God, that he may be clearly and fully acknowledged the only-begotten Son.

son. For although to be born of a Virgin be in it self miraculous, and justly entitles *Christ* unto the *Son of God*; yet is it not so far above the production of all mankind, as to place him in that singular eminence which must be attributed to the onely-begotten. We read of *Adam the Son of God*, as well as *Seth the Son of Adam*: and surely the framing *Christ* out of a Woman cannot so far transcend the making *Adam* out of the Earth, as to cause so great a distance as we must believe between the first and second *Adam*. Beside, there were many while our Saviour preached on earth who did believe his doctrine, and did confess him to be the *Son of God*, who in all probability understood nothing of his being born of a Virgin; much less did they foresee his rising from the dead, or inheriting all things. Wherefore supposing all these ways by which *Christ* is represented to us as the *Son of God*, we shall find out one more yet, far more proper in it self, and more peculiar unto him, in which no other Son can have the least pretence of share or of similitude, and consequently in respect of which we must confess him the *Onely-begotten*. Luke 3. 38.

To which purpose I observe, that the actual possession of his inheritance, which was our fourth title to his Sonship, presupposeth his Resurrection, which was the third: and his commission to his Office, which was the second, presupposeth his generation of a Virgin, as the first. But I shall now endeavour to find another generation, by which the same *Christ* was begotten, and consequently a Son, before he was conceived in the Virgin's womb. Which that I may be able to evince, I shall proceed in this following Method, as not onely most facile and perspicuous, but also most convincing and conclusive. First, I will clearly prove out of the holy Scriptures, that *Jesus Christ*, born of the Virgin *Mary*, had an actual being or subsistence before the Holy Ghost did come upon the Virgin, or the power of the Highest did overshadow her. Secondly, I will demonstrate from the same Scriptures, that the being which he had antecedently to his conception in the Virgin's womb was not any created being, but essentially Divine. Thirdly, we will shew that the Divine essence which he had, he received as communicated to him by the Father. Fourthly, we will declare this communication of the Divine nature to be a proper generation, by which he which communicateth is a proper Father, and he to whom it is communicated, a proper Son. Lastly, we will manifest that the Divine essence was never communicated in that manner to any person but to him, that never any was so begotten besides himself, and consequently, in respect of that Divine generation, he is most properly and perfectly the *onely begotten Son of the Father*.

As for the first, that *Jesus Christ* had a real being or existence, by which he truly was, before he was conceived of the Virgin *Mary*, I thus demonstrate. He which was really in Heaven, and truly descended from thence, and came into the World from the Father, before that which was begotten of the Virgin ascended into Heaven or went unto the Father, he had a real being or existence before he was conceived in the Virgin, and distinct from that being which was conceived in her. This is most clear and evident, upon these three suppositions not to be denied. First, that *Christ* did receive no other being or nature after his Conception before his Ascension, then what was begotten of the Virgin. Secondly, that what was begotten of the Virgin had its first being here on Earth, and therefore could not really be in Heaven till it ascended thither. Thirdly, that what was really in Heaven, really was; because nothing can be present in any place, which is not. Upon these suppositions, certainly true, the first proposition cannot be denied. Wherefore I assume; *Jesus Christ* was really in Heaven, and truly descended from thence, and came into the World from the Father, before that which was begotten of

John 6. 62.
 διαφύγει ὡς
 ἵκετο το
 παρ, ὅταν
 τὸν αὐτὸν
 ἐπαρῇ.
 Acts 1. 9.
 ἐν ὧ.

the Virgin ascended into Heaven, or went unto the Father; as I shall particularly prove by the express words of the Scripture. Therefore I conclude, that *Jesus Christ* had a real being or existence before he was conceived in the Virgin, and distinct from that being which was conceived in her. Now that he was really in Heaven before he ascended thither, appeareth by his own words to his Disciples; *What and if you shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before?* For he speaketh of a real ascension, such as was to be seen or looked upon, such as they might view as Spectatours. The place to which that ascension tended was truly and really the Heaven of heavens. The Verb substantive, not otherwise used, sufficiently testifieth, not a figurative, but a real, being, especially considering the opposition in the word *before*. Whether we look upon the time of speaking, then present, or the time of his ascension, then to come, his being or existing in Heaven was *before*. Nor is this now at last denied, that he was in Heaven before the ascension mentioned in these words, but that he was there before he ascended at all. We shall therefore farther shew that this ascension was the first; that what was born of the Virgin was never in Heaven before this time of which he speaks: and being in Heaven before this ascension, he must be acknowledged to have been there before he ascended at all. If *Christ* had ascended into Heaven before his death, and descended from thence, it had been the most remarkable action in all his life, and the proof thereof of the greatest efficacy toward the disseminating of the Gospel. And can we imagine so divine an action of so high concernment could have passed, and none of the Evangelists ever make mention of it? Those which are so diligent in the description of his Nativity and Circumcision, his oblation in the Temple, his reception by *Simeon*, his adoration by the Wise-men; those which have described his descent into *Aegypt*; would they have omitted his ascent into Heaven? Do they tell us of the wisdom which he shewed when he disputed with the Doctors? and were it not worthy our knowledge whether it were before he was in Heaven or after? The diligent seeking of *Joseph* and *Mary*, and her words when they found him, *Son, why hast thou dealt so with us?* shew that he had not been missing from them till then, and consequently not ascended into Heaven. After that he went down to *Nazareth*, and *was subject to them*: and I understand not how he should ascend into Heaven, and at the same time be subject to them; or there receive his Commission and Instructions as the great Legate of God, or Embassadour from Heaven, and return again unto his old subjection; and afterwards to go to *John* to be baptized of him, and to expect the descent of the Spirit for his Inauguration. Immediately from *Jordan* he is carried into the Wilderness to be tempted of the Devil: and 'twere strange if any time could then be found for his Ascension: for *he was forty days in the wilderness*, and certainly Heaven is no such kind of place; he was all that time *with the beasts*, who undoubtedly are none of the celestial Hierarchy; and *tempted of Satan*, whose dominion reacheth no higher then the air. Wherefore in those forty days *Christ* ascended not into Heaven, but rather Heaven descended unto him; for *the Angels ministred unto him*. After this *he returned in the power of the Spirit into Galilee*, and there exercised his Prophetical Office: after which there is not the least pretence of any reason for his ascension. Beside, the whole frame of this antecedent or preparatory Ascension of *Christ* is not onely raised without any written testimony of the Word, or unwritten testimony of Tradition, but is without any reason in it self, and contrary to the revealed way of our Redemption. For what reason should *Christ* ascend into Heaven to know the will of God, and not be known to ascend thither? Certainly the Father could reveal his will unto the Son as well on earth as in Heaven.

Luke 2. 48.

Mark 1. 13.

Mark 1. 13.
 Luke 4. 14.

ven. And if men must be ignorant of his ascension, to what purpose should they say he ascended, except they imagine either an impotency in the Father, or dissatisfaction in the Son? Nor is this onely asserted without reason, but also against that rule to be observed by *Christ* as he was anointed to the Sacerdotal Office. For the Holy of holies *made with hands* was the figure of the true, (that is, *Heaven it self*) into which the High-priest alone went once every year: and *Christ* as our High-priest *entred in once into the holy place*. If then they deny *Christ* was a Priest before he preached the Gospel, then did he not enter into Heaven, because the High-priest alone went into the type thereof, the Holy of holies. If they confels he was, then did he not ascend till after his death, because he was to enter in but *once*, and that not without blood. Wherefore being *Christ* ascended not into Heaven till after his death, being he certainly was in Heaven before that ascension, we have sufficiently made good that part of our Argument, that *Jesus Christ* was in Heaven before that which was begotten of the Virgin ascended thither. Now that which followeth will both illustrate and confirm it; for as he was there, so he descended from thence before he ascended thither. This he often testifieth and inculcateth of himself: *The bread of God is he which cometh down from heaven*; and, *I am the living bread which came down from heaven*. He opposeth himself unto the Manna in the Wilderness, which never was really in Heaven, or had its Original from thence. *Moses gave you not that bread from heaven*: but the Father gave *Christ* really from thence. Wherefore he saith, *I came down from heaven, not to doe mine own will, but the will of him that sent me*. Now never any person upon any occasion is said to descend from Heaven, but such as were really there before they appeared on earth, as the Father, the Holy Ghost, and the Angels: but no man, how-ever born, how-ever sanctified, sent, or dignified, is said thereby to descend from thence; but rather when any is opposed to *Christ*, the opposition is placed in this very origination. *John* the Baptist was filled with the Holy Ghost even from his mother's womb; born of an aged father and a barren mother, by the power of God: and yet he distinguisheth himself from *Christ* in this; *He that cometh from above is above all: he that is of the earth is earthy, and speaketh of the earth; he that cometh from heaven is above all*. *Adam* was framed immediately by God, without the intervention of man or woman; and yet he is so far from being thereby from Heaven, that even in that he is distinguished from the second *Adam*. For the first man is of the earth earthy, the second man is the Lord from heaven. Wherefore the descent of *Christ* from Heaven doth really presuppose his being there, and that antecedently to any ascent thither. For that he ascended, what is it, but that he also descended first? So *S. Paul*, asserting a descent as necessarily preceding his ascension, teacheth us never to imagine an ascent of *Christ* as his first motion between Heaven and earth; and consequently, that the first being or existence which *Christ* had was not what he received by his conception here on earth, but what he had before in Heaven, in respect whereof he was with the Father, from whom he came. His Disciples believed that he came out from God: and he commended that Faith, and confirmed the object of it by this assertion; *I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world: again, I leave the world, and go to the Father*. Thus having by undoubted testimonies made good the latter part of the Argument, I may safely conclude, that being *Christ* was really in Heaven, and descended from thence, and came forth from the Father, before that which was conceived of the Holy Ghost ascended thither; it cannot with any shew of reason be denied, that *Christ* had a real being and existence antecedent unto his conception here on Earth, and distinct from the being which he received here.

Secondly, we shall prove not onely a bare priority of existence, but a pre-

existence of some certain and acknowledged space of duration. For whatsoever was before *John* the Baptist and before *Abraham*, was some space of time before *Christ* was man. This no man can deny, because all must confess the blessed Virgin was first saluted by the Angel six moneths after *Elizabeth* conceived, and many hundred years after *Abraham* died. But *Jesus Christ* was really existent before *John* the Baptist, and before *Abraham*, as we shall make good by the testimony of the Scriptures. Therefore it cannot be denied but *Christ* had a real being and existence some space of time before he was made man. For the first, it is the express testimony of *John* himself; *John* 1. 15. *This is he of whom I spake, He that cometh after me is preferred before me, for he was before me.* In which words, First, he taketh to himself a priority of time, speaking of *Christ*, *he that cometh after me*: for so he came after him into the womb, at his Conception; into the world, at his Nativity; unto his Office, at his Baptism; always after *John*, and at the same distance. Secondly, he attributeth unto *Christ* a priority of dignity, saying, *he is preferred before me*; as appeareth by the reiteration of these words; *He it is who, coming after me, is preferred before me, whose shoes latchet I am not worthy to unloose.* The addition of which expression of his own unworthiness sheweth, that to be preferred before him is the same with being *worthier than he*, to which the same expression is constantly added by all the other three Evangelists. Thirdly, he rendreth the reason or cause of that great dignity which belonged to *Christ*, saying, *for, or rather, because he was before me.* And being the cause must be supposed different and distinct from the effect, therefore the priority last mentioned cannot be that of dignity. For to assign any thing as the cause or reason of it self, is a great absurdity, and the expression of it a vain tautology. Wherefore that priority must have relation to time or duration, (as the very tense, *he was before me*, sufficiently signifieth) and so be placed in opposition to his coming after him. As if *John* the Baptist had thus spoke at large: This man *Christ Jesus*, who came into the world, and entereth on his Prophetical Office six moneths after me, is notwithstanding of far more worth and greater dignity than I am; even so much greater, that I must acknowledge my self unworthy to stoop down and unloose the latchet of his shoes: and the reason of this transcendent dignity is from the excellency of that nature which he had before I was; for though he cometh after me, yet he was before me.

Now as *Christ* was before *John*, which speaks a small, so was he also before *Abraham*, which speaks a larger time. *Jesus* himself hath asserted this pre-existence to the Jews; *Verily verily, I say unto you, Before Abraham was, I am.* Which words, plainly and literally expounded, must evidently contain this truth. For first, *Abraham* in all the Scriptures never hath any other signification then such as denotes the person called by that name; and the question to which these words are directed by way of answer, without controversy spake of the same person. Beside, *Abraham* must be the subject of that proposition, *Abraham was*; because a proposition cannot be without a subject, and if *Abraham* be the predicate, there is none. Again, as we translate *Abraham was*, in a tense signifying the time past; so it is most certainly to be understood, because that which he speaks unto is the pre-existence of *Abraham*, and that of long duration; so that whatsoever had concerned his present estate or future condition had been wholly impertinent to the precedent question. Lastly, the expression, *I am*, seeming something unusual or improper to signify a priority in respect of any thing past, because no present instant is before that which precedeth, but that which followeth: yet the * use of it sufficient-

* So Nonnus here more briefly and plainly than usual;

* Ἀβραμ πάλιν γένεσθαι, ἐγὼ πάλιν. So *John* 14. 9. πῶς πῦν χρόνον μετ' ἐμῶν εἰμι, καὶ ἐκ ἐχθρονος εἰμι; Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me? and *John* 15. 27. ἐν αὐτῷ αἰῶνι μετ' ἐμοῦ εἰσι, because ye have been (or continued)

tinued) with me from the beginning. Thus Novatus, Ἐξ ἀρχῆς γενεαὶς ὅλων σμύττες εἶμι, John 6.24. "Οτι ἔν ᾧ ἔσεν ὁ ὄχλος ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἐκ ἐστὶν ἐκεῖ. When the people saw that Jesus was not there. Not only doth S. John use thus, the present tense for that which is past, but as frequently for that which is to come. For as before, πῶς ἔπειτα ἔμελλεν εἶμι, so on the contrary, ἐπὶ μικρῶν χρόνων μεθ' ὑμῶν εἶμι. John 7.33. and ὅπου εἶμι ἐγὼ, ἐκεῖ καὶ ὁ δίδων ὁ ὁ εὐδὲς ἔσται. John 12.26. 14.3. 17.24. therefore it is very indifferent whether (John 7.34.) we read εἶμι ἐγὼ, or ὅπου εἶμι. For Novatus seems to have read it εἶμι by his translation, εἰς ἀστράπην ὡς ὁ δίδω. and the Jews question, πῶς ἔτι ὁ μέλλας περὶ εἶμι; shows they understood it so: for this εἶμι, though of a present for me, is of a future signification. Helyc. Εἶμι, περὶ εἶμι. And so it agreeth with that which follows, John 8.21. ὅπου ἐγὼ εἶμι, ὑμεῖς δὲ δώσατε ἐλθεῖν. If we read εἶμι, as the old Translation, ubi ego sum, it will have the force of εἶμι, and agree with the other; ἵνα ὅπου εἶμι ἐγὼ, καὶ ὑμεῖς ἔτε. Howsoever it is clear, S. John used the present εἶμι either in relation to what is past, or what is to come, and is therefore to be interpreted as the matter in hand requireth. And certainly the place now under our consideration can admit no other relation but to the time already past, in which Abraham lived. And we find the present tense in the same manner joyned with the Aorist elsewhere: as Psal. 90.2. καὶ τὸ ὄν γενεθλίας, καὶ παλαιάται γὰρ καὶ ὁ κενώσθαι, καὶ κατὰ αὐτὸν ἔως τῶ αὐτῶν, καὶ ἔτι. What can be more parallel then, καὶ τὸ ὄν γενεθλίας, καὶ παλαιάται, καὶ ἔτι. And so it is, ἐγὼ εἶμι? In the same manner, though by another word, καὶ τὸ ὄν ἐπαδυναί, καὶ ὁ παλαιὸν βασιλεὺς, γενεθλίας. Prov. 8.25.

ly maintaineth, and the nature of the place absolutely requirerth, that it should not here denote a present being, but a priority of existence, together with a continuation of it till the present time. And then the words will plainly signify thus much: Do you question how I could see Abraham, who am not yet fifty years old? Verily verily, I say unto you, † Before ever Abraham, the person whom you speak of, was born, I had a real being and existence, (by which I was capable of the sight of him) in which I have continued untill now. In this sense certainly the Jews understood our Saviour's answer, as pertinent to their question, but in their opinion blasphemous; and therefore they took up stones to cast at him.

This literal and plain explication is yet farther necessary; because those which once recede from it, do not only wrest and pervert the place, but also invent and suggest an answer unworthy of and wholly misbecoming him that spake it. For (setting aside the addition, of the *light of the world*, which there can be no * shew of reason to admit;) whether they interpret the former part (*before Abraham was*) of something to come, as the calling of the Gentiles, or the latter (*I am*) of a pre-existence in the Divine foreknowledge and appointment; they represent *Christ* with a great asseveration highly and strongly asserting that which is nothing to the purpose to which he speaks, nothing to any other purpose at all: and they propound the Jews senselessly offended and foolishly exasperated with those words, which any of them might have spoken as well as he. For the first interpretation makes our Saviour thus to speak: Do ye so much wonder how I should have seen Abraham, who am not yet fifty years old? do ye imagine so great a contradiction in this? I tell you, and be ye most assured that what I speak unto you at this time is most certainly and infallibly true, and most worthy of your observation, which moves me not to deliver it without this solemn asseveration, (*Verily verily, I say unto you*) Before Abraham shall perfectly become that which was signified in his name, *the father of many Nations*, before the Gentiles shall come in, *I am*. Nor be ye troubled at this answer, or think in this I magnifie my self: for what I speak is as true of you as 'tis of me; before Abraham be thus made Abraham, ye are. Doubt ye not therefore, as ye did, nor ever make that question again, whether *I have seen Abraham*. The second explication makes a sense of another nature, but with the same impertinency. Do ye continue still to question, and that with so much admiration? do ye look upon my age, and ask, *Hast thou seen Abraham*? I confess 'tis more then eighteen hundred years since that Patriarch died, and less then forty since I was born at *Bethlehem*: but look not on

potest. Catech. Racov. Whereas there is no ground for any such connexion. That discourse of the light of the world was in the Treasury, v. 20. that which followeth was not, at least appeareth not to be so. Therefore the ellipsis of the 24. and 28. verses is not to be supplied by the 13. but the 24. from the 23. ἐγὼ ἐκ ἐπὶ ἀναβέη εἶμι, and the 28. either from the same, or that which is most general, his Office, ἐγὼ εἶμι ὁ ἁγίος. Again v. 31. 'tis very probable that a new discourse is again begun, and therefore if there were an ellipsis in the words alleged, it would have no relation to either of the former supplies, or if to either, to the latter; but indeed it hath to neither.

this

† So the Ethiopick Version, Amen dico vobis, priusquam Abraham nasceretur, fui ego; and the Persian, Vere vere vobis dico, quod nondum Abraham factus erat, cum ego eram.

* This is the shift of the Socinians, who make this speech of Christ elliptical, and then supply it from the 13. verse. I am the light of the world. Quod vero ea verba, Ego sum, sint ad eum modum supplenda, ac simpliciter subiectae iis, Ego sum lux mundi, superius est principio ejus rationis, v. 13. & hinc quod Christus bis se ipsum iisdem, Ego sum, lucem mundi, vocaverit, v. 24. & 28. deprehendi

this computation, for before *Abraham* was born, I was. But mistake me not, I mean in the foreknowledge and decree of God. Nor do I magnifie my self in this, for ye were so. How either of these answers should give any reasonable satisfaction to the question, or the least occasion of the *Jews* exasperation, is not to be understood. And that our Saviour should speak any such impertinencies as these interpretations bring forth, is not by a Christian to be conceived. Wherefore being the plain and most obvious sense is a proper and full answer to the question, and most likely to exasperate the unbelieving *Jews*; being those strained explications render the words of *Christ*, not onely impertinent to the occasion, but vain and useless to the hearers of them; being our Saviour gave this answer in words of another language, most probably uncapable of any such interpretations: we must adhere unto that literal sense already delivered, by which it appeareth *Christ* had a being, as before *John*, so also before *Abraham*, (not onely before *Abram* became *Abraham*, but before *Abraham* was *Abram*) and consequently that he did exist two thousand years before he was born, or conceived by the Virgin.

Thirdly, we shall extend this pre-existence to a far longer space of time, to the end of the first world, nay to the beginning of it. For he which was before the Flood, and at the Creation of the world, had a being before he was conceived by the Virgin. But *Christ* was really before the Flood, for he preached to them that lived before it; and at the Creation of the world, for he created it. That he preached to those before the Flood, is evident by the words of *S. Peter*, who saith, that *Christ* was put to death in the *Flesh*, but quickned by the Spirit; By which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison, Which sometime were disobedient, when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of *Noah*, while the Ark was a-preparing. From which words it appeareth, that *Christ* preached by the same Spirit by the virtue of which he was raised from the dead: but that Spirit was not his Soul, but something of a greater power. Secondly, that those to whom he preached were such as were disobedient. Thirdly, that the time when they were disobedient was the time before the Flood, while the Ark was preparing. It is certain then that *Christ* did preach unto those persons which in the days of *Noah* were disobedient all that time the long-suffering of God waited, and, consequently, so long as repentance was offered. And it is as certain that he never preached to them after they died; which I shall not need here to prove, because those against whom I bring this Argument deny it not. It followeth therefore, that he preached to them while they lived, and were disobedient; for in the refusing of that mercy which was offered to them by the preaching of *Christ*, did their disobedience principally consist. In vain then are we taught to understand *S. Peter* of the promulgation of the Gospel to the Gentiles after the Holy Ghost descended upon the Apostles, when the words themselves refuse all relation to any such times or persons. For all those of whom *S. Peter* speaks were disobedient in the days of *Noah*. But none of those to whom the Apostles preached were ever disobedient in the days of *Noah*. Therefore none of those to which the Apostles preached were any of those of which *S. Peter* speaks. It remaineth therefore that the plain interpretation be acknowledged for the true, that *Christ* did preach unto those men which lived before the Flood, even while they lived, and consequently that he was before it. For though this was not done by an immediate act of the Son of God, as if he personally had appeared on earth, and actually preached to that old world; but by

1 Pet. 3. 18,
19, 20.

Ἀπεσταλμένοι
πότε, ὅτε ἂν
παρ' ἐξουσί-
ας ἡ τοῦ
Θεοῦ μακρο-
θυμία ἐν ἡ-
μεῖς Νώε.

by the † ministry of a Prophet, by the sending of Noah, ^a the eighth preacher of righteousness: yet to doe any thing by another not able to perform it without him, as much demonstrates the existence of the principal cause, as if he did it of himself without any intervening instrument.

† Propheta ab ipso habentes dominum in illum prophetaverunt. Barnabe Epist.

* 2 Pet. 2. 5. I have thus translated this place of S. Peter, because it may adde some advantage to the argument: for if Noah were the eighth preacher of righteousness, and he were sent by the Son of God; no man, I conceive, will deny that the seven before him were sent by the same Son: and so by this we have gained the pre-existence of another 1000 years. How-ever those words, *ἄλλ' ὅδε Νῶς δικαιοσύνης κήρυξ ἐβόλας*, may be better interpreted then they are, when we translate them, but saved Noah the eighth person, a preacher of righteousness. For first, if we look upon the Greek phrase, *ὅδε Νῶς* may be not the eighth person, but one of eight, or Noah with seven more; in which it signifieth not the order in which he was in respect of the rest, but only consignifieth the number which were with him. As when we read in the Supplices of Aeschylus, *Τὸ δὲ πικρότερον σέας, Τέτιν τὶς ἐς Διότιος Δίκας ἤλασται μαρτυρίῃ*, we must not understand it, as if Honour due to parents were the third Commandment at Athens, but one of the three remarkable laws left at Eleusis by Triptolemus. So Porphyrius, *ἑσὶ δὲ τὸ Τριπτόλεμον Ἀθηνάϊος νομοθετήσαντα, ἐν τῷ νόμῳ αὐτοῦ πρὸς τὴν Σενοκράτους ὁ φιλόσοφος λέγει διαβεβαιῶν ἑλθεῖν τὸςδε τοὺς πρῶτον. Οὗτος καρπὸς ἀγρίων. Ζῶα μὴ σφίγγος.* De Asistent. l. 4. Which words are thus translated by S. Hierome, who hath made use of most part of that fourth Book of Porphyrius: Xenocrates Philosophus de Triptolemi legibus apud Athenienses tria tantum præcepta in templo Eleusinae rescire scribit; Honorandos Parentes, Venerandos Deos, Carnibus non vescendum. Adver. Jovinianum lib. 2. Where we see Honour due to parents the first precept, though by Aeschylus called the third, not in respect of the order, but the number. Thus Dinarchus the Orator, *Καὶ τὰς Σεμνὰς Δίκας αὐς ἐκεῖν ἰσοκράτους ἀπαρτάς Νῶς* & αὐτὸς. From whence we must not collect that the person of whom he speaks was the tenth in order of that Office, so that nine were necessarily before or above him, and many more might be after or below him: but from hence it is inferred, that there were ten *ἰεργατοὶ* waiting on the Σεμνὰς Δίκας, and no more, of which number that man was one. After this manner speak the Attick Writers, especially Thucydides. And so we may understand S. Peter, that God preserved Noah (a preacher of righteousness) with seven more, of which he desireth to be named the first, rather then the last or eighth. But secondly, the Original *ὅδε Νῶς* may possibly not belong to the name or person of Noah, but to his title or office; and then we must translate, *ὅδε Νῶς δικαιοσύνης κήρυξ*, Noah the eighth preacher of righteousness. For we read at the birth of Enos, that men began to call upon the name of the Lord, Gen. 4. 26. which the ancients understood peculiarly of his person: as the LXX, *ἔτ' ἡλπισιν ἐμυδάμεν τὸ ὄνομα Κυρίου τοῦ Θεοῦ*, and the vulgar Latine, *Ille cepit invocare nomen Domini*. The Jews have a tradition, that God sent in the Sea upon mankind in the days of Enos, and destroyed many. From whence it seems Enos was a Preacher, or Prophet, and so the rest that followed him; and then Noah is the eighth.

The second part of the Argument, that *Christ* made this world, and consequently had a real being at the beginning of it, the Scriptures manifestly and plentifully assure us. For the same Son, by whom in these last days God spake unto us, is he by whom also he made the worlds. So that, as through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so must we * also believe that they were made by the Son of God. Which the Apostle doth not onely in the entrance of his Epistle deliver, but in the sequele prove. For shewing greater things have been spoken of him then ever were attributed to any of the Angels, the most glorious of all the creatures of God; amongst the rest he saith, the Scripture spake ^a unto the Son, *Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever.* And not onely so, but also, *Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the work of thine hands. They shall perish, but thou remainest: and they all shall wax old as doth a garment; And as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed: but thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail.* Now whatsoever the person be to whom these words were spoken, it cannot be denied but he was the Creatour of the world. For he must be acknowledged the maker of the earth, who laid the foundation of it; and he may justly challenge to himself the making of the Heavens, who can say, they are the work of his hands. But these words were spoken to the Son of God, as the Apostle himself acknowledgeth, and it appeareth out of the order and series of the chapter; the design of which is to declare the supereminent excellency of our Saviour *Christ*. Nay, the conjunction *And* referrs this place of the Psalmist † plainly to the former, of which he had said expressly, *but unto the Son he saith. As sure then as Thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever*, was said unto the Son; so certain it is, *Thou, Lord, hast laid the foundation of the earth*, was said unto the same. Nor is it possible to avoid the

Heb. 1. 2.

Heb. II. 3.

* It being in both places expressed in the same phrase by the same Author, *ὅς ἐστι τὸς αἰῶνας ἐποίησεν*, Heb. I. 2. *τίς ἐστι τοῦ κόσμου καταστήσας*, τὸς αἰῶνας *ἐποίησας*, Heb. I. 8, 10. II, 12.

Comma after *Kaὶ* in the Greek and *Et* in the Latine. And whereas it is evident that there are distinctions in the Latine and Greek Copies after that conjunction, he flies to the ancientest Copies, which all men know were not careless of distinctions, and wrogeth that there is no addition of *rursus* or the like after *Et*; whereas in the Syriack translation we find expressly that addition *בְּרִי*.

Q

Apostle's

Apostle's connexion by attributing the Destruction of the Heavens, out of the last words, to the Son, and denying the Creation of them, out of the first, to the same. For it is most evident that there is but one person spoken to, and that the Destruction and the Creation of the Heavens are both attributed to the same. Whosoever therefore shall grant that the Apostle produced this Scripture to shew that the Son of God shall destroy the Heavens, must withall acknowledge that he created them : whosoever denieth him to be here spoken of as the Creatour, must also deny him to be understood as the Destroyer. Wherefore being the words of the Psalmist were undoubtedly spoken of and to our Saviour, (or else the Apostle hath attributed that unto him which never belonged to him, and consequently the spirit of *S. Paul* mistook the spirit of *David*;) being to whomsoever any part of them belongs, the whole is applicable, because they are delivered unto one ; being the literal exposition is so clear that no man hath ever pretended to a metaphoricall : it remaineth as an undeniable truth, grounded upon the profession of the Psalmist, and the interpretation of an Apostle, that the Son of God created the world. Nor needed we so long to have insisted upon this testimony, because there are so many which testifie as much, but onely that this is of a peculiar nature and different from the rest. For they which deny this truth of the Creation of the world by the Son of God, notwithstanding all those Scriptures produced to confirm it, have found two ways to avoid or decline the force of them. If they speak so plainly and literally of the work of Creation, that they will not endure any figurative interpretation, then they endeavour to shew that they are not spoken of the Son of God. If they speak so expressely of our Saviour *Christ*, as that by no machination they can be applied to any other person, then their whole design is to make the Creation attributed unto him appear to be merely metaphoricall. The place before alledged is of the first kind, which speaketh so clearly of the Creation or real production of the world, that they never denied it : and I have so manifestly shewed it spoken to the Son of God, that it is beyond all possibility of gain-saying.

Col. 1. 14.

Col. 1. 15,
16, 17.

† The first-born of every creature is taken by Origen for an expression declaring the Divinity of Christ, and used by him as a phrase in opposition to his Humanity to express the same. Ελέγοντο δ' ἐν τοῖς αἰωνότοις, ὅτι αὐτὸς πρῶτος ἐστὶν τοῦ Θεοῦ. In relation to the precedent words, τὸν υἱὸν τὸν ἀρχαῖον αὐτοῦ, for that υἱὸς ἀρχαῖος was the υἱὸς πρωτόγονος.

Thus having asserted the Creation acknowledged real unto *Christ*, we shall the easier persuade that likewise to be such which is pretended to be metaphoricall. In the Epistle to the *Colossians* we reade of the Son of God, *in whom we have redemption through his blood* ; and we are sure those words can be spoken of none other then *Jesus Christ*. He therefore it must be who was thus described by the Apostle ; *Who is the image of the invisible God, the first-born of every creature. For by him were all things created that are in heaven and that are in earth, visible and invisible ; whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers : all things were created by him, and for him. And he is before all things, and by him all things consist.* In which words our Saviour is expressely styled the † *first-born of every Creature*, that is, begotten by God, as the * *Son of his love*, antecedently to all other emanations, before any thing proceeded from him, or was framed and created by him. And that precedency is presently proved by this undeniable Argument, that all other emanations or productions came from him, and whatsoever received its being by Creation was by him created. Which assertion is delivered in the most proper, full, and pregnant expressions imaginable. First, in the vulgar phrase of *Moses*, as most consonant to his description ; *for by him were all things created that are in heaven and that are in earth* ; signifying thereby, that he speaketh of the same Creation. Secondly, by a division which *Moses* never used, as

descri-

describing the production onely of corporeall substances : lest therefore those immaterial beings might seem exempted from the Son's creation, because omitted in *Moses* his description, he addeth *visible and invisible* ; and lest in that invisible world, among the many degrees of the celestial Hierarchy, any Order might seem exempted from an essential dependence upon him, he nameth those which are of greatest eminence, *whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers*, and under them comprehendeth all the rest. Nor doth it yet suffice, thus to extend the object of his power by asserting all things to be made by him, except it be so understood as to acknowledge the sovereignty of his Person and the authority of his Action. For lest we should conceive the Son of God framing the world as a mere instrumental cause which worketh by and for another, he sheweth him as well the final as the efficient cause ; for *all things were created by him, and for him*. Lastly, whereas all things first receive their being by creation, and when they have received it, continue in the same by virtue of God's conservation, *in whom we live, and move, and have our being* ; lest in any thing we should be thought not to depend immediately upon the Son of God, he is described as the Conserver, as well as the Creatour ; for *he is before all things, and by him all things consist*. If then we consider the two last cited verses by themselves, we cannot deny but they are a most compleat description of the Creatour of the world ; and if they were spoken of God the Father, could be no way injurious to his Majesty, who is no-where more plainly or fully set forth unto us as the Maker of the world.

Now although this were sufficient to persuade us to interpret this place of the making of the world ; yet it will not be unfit to make use of another reason, which will compell us so to understand it. For undoubtedly there are but two kinds of Creation in the language of the Scriptures, the one literal, the other metaphorical ; one old, the other new ; one by way of formation, the other by way of reformation. *If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature*, saith *S. Paul* ; ^{2 Cor. 5. 17.} and again, *In Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature*. ^{Gal. 6. 15. and 5. 6.} In stead of which words he had before, *faith working by love*. ^{Ephes. 2. 10.} For we are the workmanship of God, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them. From whence it is evident that a new creature is such a person as truly believeth in Christ, and manifesteth that faith by the exercise of good works ; and the new creation is the reforming or bringing man into this new condition, which by nature or his first creation he was not in. And therefore he which is so created is called a new man, in opposition to the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts : From whence the Apostle chargeth us to be renewed in the spirit of our mind, and to put on that new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness ; and which is renewed in knowledge, after the image of him that created him. ^{Eph. 4. 22, 23, 24.} The new creation then is described to us as consisting wholly in * renovation, or a translation from a worse unto a better condition by way of reformation ; by which those which have lost the image of God, in which the first man was created, are restored to the image of the same God again, by a real change, though not substantial, wrought within them. Now this being the notion of the new creation in all those places which undoubtedly and confessedly speak of it, it will be necessary to apply it unto such Scriptures as are pretended to require the same interpretation. Thus therefore I proceed. If the second or new creation cannot be meant by the Apostle in the

das, 'Αναγέννησις, ἢ ἀνανέωσις' λέγεται ἢ ἀνακαταβολή, which is the language of the New Testament. This Renovation being thus called γεννήσις, the Ancients framed a proper word for it, which is, ἀνάκλισις. ἐν ἣ γίνεται πάντων τοῦ ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ χρί & τοῦ ἐν τῷ σώματι καὶ τῶν ἀνείρεων. Just. Qu. & Resp. ad Græcos. This new creation doth so necessarily inferre an alteration, that it is called by S. Paul a Metamorphosis ; μεταμορφώσις τῇ ἀναγεννώσει τοῦ νοῦ ὑμῶν. Rom. 12. 2.

† 'Ev ἀρχῆς;
the first word
of Moses;
whence the
Syriack Tran-
slation.
ברשית.

מראש
מקדמי
ארץ

ἐν ἀρχῇ ὡς
 ὅτι γὰρ πρὸ-
 τῆς
 Prov. 8.23.

In principio
erat Sermo;
in quo prin-
cipio scilicet
Deus fecit
cælum &
terram.

Tertull. adv.
Hermog. c. 20.

* Πρὸς τὸν
Θεὸν, that is,
πρὸς τὸν
Θεῶν, that is,

by God. As
Nounus, Πα-
τὴρ ἔλω ἀ-
νέμει, ἀ-
νέμει (ἡ-
προν ἔδφη)
As wise dome
speaketh,

Prov. 8. 37.

then I was by him. **אֶרֶץ וְאֶתְּלָא** ἡμεῖς παρ' αὐτοῦ. **Chald. וְהָיִיתָ צָרוּ** & eram in latere ejus. **Ἀποχόπουλος** ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ. **θεὸς τὸν Θεόν, τὰς τὰς, ὡς ὁ Θεός.** As Matt. 13. 56. **Αἱ ἀδελφαὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ πάντα τοὺς υἱοὺς αὐτοῦ;** Mar. 14. 49. **καὶ ἡμεῖς ἡμεῖς υἱοὺς αὐτοῦ.** 1 Cor. 16. 6. **τοὺς υἱοὺς ὃν ἡμεῖς παρὰ αὐτοῦ.** **Περὶ τοῦ θεοῦ διακρίσει.** **ἰσὺς Χριστός, ὃς τοὺς ἀδελφούς τοὺς Πατέρι ὡς, ὡς τὴν ἐκείνου ἐκείνου.** Ignat. ad Adnan. **Gen. 1. 26. Gen. 3. 22. Gen. 1. 3. Psal. 33. 6. Heb. 11. 3. 2 Pet. 3. 5.** † I conceive this Chaldaee Paraphrase to represent the sense of the Jews of that Age, as being their publick interpretation of the Scripture. wherefore what we find common and frequent in it, we cannot but think the vulgar and general opinion of that Nation. Now it is certain that this Paraphrase doth often use **מִמְרֵי** the Word of God, for **וְהָיִיתָ** God himself, and that especially with relation to the creation of the world. As Isa. 45. 12. **אֲנִי עָשִׂיתִי אֶרֶץ וְאֶתְּלָא** I made the earth, and created man upon it, faith the Lord, the Holy One of Israel; which the Chaldaee translates **עֲבַדְתָּ אֶתְּלָא** אֲנִי בְּמִמְרֵי **אֶרֶץ** I by my word made the earth, and created man upon it. In the same manner, Jer. 27. 5. I made the earth, and men and beasts on the face of the earth: the Targum **אֶרֶץ וְאֶתְּלָא** אֲנִי בְּמִמְרֵי **עֲבַדְתָּ יְהוָה** And Isa. 48. 13. **אֶרֶץ וְאֶתְּלָא** אֲנִי בְּמִמְרֵי **עֲבַדְתָּ יְהוָה** My hand also founded the earth: the Chaldaee **אֶרֶץ וְאֶתְּלָא** אֲנִי בְּמִמְרֵי **עֲבַדְתָּ יְהוָה** Etiam in verbo meo fundavi terram. And most clearly Gen. 1. 27. we reade, Et creavit Deus hominem; the Jerusalem Targum, Verbum Domini creavit hominem. And Gen. 3. 8. Audierunt vocem Domini Dei: the Chaldaee Paraphrase **וְהָיִיתָ צָרוּ** וְהָיִיתָ צָרוּ **וְהָיִיתָ צָרוּ** And audierunt vocem verbi Domini Dei. Now this which the Chaldaee Paraphrase called **מִמְרֵי**, the Hellenists named **Λόγος** as appeareth by Philo the Jew, who wrote before S. John, and reckons, in his Divinity, first **Πατέρι** ὁ Θεός, then **ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ**, and lastly **ὁ Λόγος**.

Quæst. & Solut. Whom he calls ὁ δὲν Θεὸς Λόγον, ἀεττοζον ὑόν, De Agricult. He attributes the Creation of the world to this Λόγος, whom he terms ὁρζανον Θεὸς, δὲ ὁ (ὁ λόγος) καὶ σὺν δ' αὖτε, De Flammeo gladio. Σὺν δὲ Θεὸς ὁ Λόγος αὖτε δὲν, ὁ καὶ δὲν ὁρζανον ἀεττοζον ὑόν ἐνοσημοί. Idem Allegor. 12. Where we must observe, though Philo makes the Λόγος of whom he speaks as instrumental in the Creation of the world; yet he taketh it not for a bare expression of the will of God, but for a God, though in the second degree, and expressly for the Son of God. Nor ought we to look on Philo Judeus in this as a Platonist, but merely as a Jew, who refers his whole Doctrine of this Λόγος to the first chapter of Genesis. And the rest of the Jews before him, who had no such knowledge out of Plato's School, used the same notion. For as Isa. 48. 13. the hand of God, is by the Chaldee Paraphrast translated the Word of God: so in the book of Wisdom, ἡ πᾶσι δὲ σώματα ἔχοντες ὁ Χρὶς καὶ ἡ σοφία τὸν κόσμον, Sap. 11. 17. is changed into ὁ παρ- τοδωμένος ὁ Λόγος ἀπ' ἐξουσίας, 18. 15. and Siracides 43. 26. Ἐν λόγῳ αὐτοῦ ἐργάσθηται πᾶσι. Nay the Septuagint hath chan- ged Shaddai, the undoubted name of the omnipotent God, into Λόγος the Word, Ezek. 1. 24. יְהוָה-וְכָכּ quasi vox sublimis Dei, quod Hebraice appellatur יְהוָה, & juxta LXX. φωνὴ τοῦ Λόγου, id est, vox Verbi, ut universæ quæ prædicantur in mundo vocem Filii Dei esse dicamus. S. Hieron. And therefore Celsus, writing in the person of a Jew, acknowledgeth that the Word is the Son of God. Εἰ γὰρ ὁ Λόγος δὲν ὑμῶν ὑὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ἡμῶν ἐμμανύμενος. Orig. adv. Celsum, l. 2. And although Origen object that in this Celsus makes the Jew speak improperly, because the Jews which he had conversed with did never acknowledge that the Son of God was the Word; yet Celsus his Jew did speak the language of Philo: but between the time of Celsus and that of Origen, (I enquire about threescore years,) the Jews had learnt to deny that notion of Λόγος, that they might with more colour reject S. John. If then all the Jews, both they which understood the Chaldee exposition, and those which only used the Greek Translation, had such a notion of the Word of God; if all things by their confession were made by the Word; we have no reason to believe S. John should make use of any other Notion than what they before had, and that by means whereof he might be so easily understood.

delivered so great a mystery in so few words, as speaking unto them who at the first apprehension understood him. Onely that which as yet they knew not was, that this Word was made flesh, and that this Word made flesh was *Jesus Christ*. Wherefore this exposition being so literally clear in it self, so consonant to the notion of the Word, and the apprehension of the Jews; it is infinitely to be preferred before any such interpretation as shall restrain the most universals to a few particulars, change the plainest expressions into figurative phrases, and make of a sublime truth, a weak, useles, false discourse. For who will grant that *in the beginning* must be the same with that in S. John's Epistle, *from the beginning*, especially when the very interpretation involves in it self a contradiction? For *the beginning* in S. John's Epistle is that in which the Apostles saw, and heard, and touched the Word: *the beginning* in his Gospel was that in which *the Word was with God*, that is, not seen nor heard by the Apostles, but known as yet to God alone, as the new exposition will have it. Who will conceive it worthy of the Apostle's assertion, to teach that the Word had a being in the beginning of the Gospel, at what time John the Baptist began to preach, when we know the Baptist taught as much, who therefore *came baptizing with water, that he might be made manifest unto Israel*? when we are sure that S. Matthew and S. Luke, who wrote before him, taught us more then this, that he had a being thirty years before? when we are assured, it was as true of any other then living as of the Word, even of Judas who betrayed him, even of Pilate who condemned him? Again, who can imagine the Apostle should assert that the Word was, that is, had an actual being, when as yet he was not actually the Word? For if *the beginning* be when John the Baptist began to preach, and the Word, as they say, be nothing else but he which speaketh, and so revealeth the will of God; *Christ* had not then revealed the will of God, and consequently was not then actually the Word, but onely potentially or by designation. Secondly, 'tis a strange figurative speech, *the Word was with God*, that is, was known to God, especially in this Apostle's method. *In the beginning was the Word*; there must signifie an actual existence: and if so, why in the next sentence (*the Word was with God*) shall the same verb signifie an objective being onely? Certainly though to be in the beginning be one thing, and to be with God, another; yet *to be* in either of them is the same. But if we should imagine this being understood of the knowledge of God, why we should grant that thereby is signified he was known to God alone, I cannot conceive. For the Proposition of it self is plainly affirmative, and the exclusive particle *onely* added to the exposition maketh it clearly negative. Nay more, the affirmative sense is certainly true, the negative as certainly false. For except *Gabriel* be God,

God, who came to the Virgin; except every one of the heavenly host which appeared to the Shepherds be God; except *Zachary* and *Elizabeth*, except *Simon* and *Anna*, except *Joseph* and *Mary* be God; it cannot be true that he was known to God only, for to all these he was certainly known. Thirdly, to pass by the third attribute, *and the Word was God*, as having occasion suddenly after to handle it; seeing the Apostle hath again repeated the circumstance of time as most material, *the same was in the beginning with God*, and immediately subjoyned those words, *all things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made*; how can we receive any exposition which referreth not the making of all these things to him in the beginning? But if we understand the latter part of the Apostles, who after the Ascension of our Saviour did nothing but what they were commanded and impowered to doe by *Christ*, it will bear no relation to the beginning. If we interpret the former, of all which *Jesus* said and did in the promulgation of the Gospel, we cannot yet reach to the beginning assigned by the new Expositours: For while *John* the Baptist only preached, while in their sense the Word was with God, they will not affirm that *Jesus* did any of these things that here are spoken of. And consequently, according to their grounds, it will be true to say, In the beginning was the Word, and that Word in the beginning was with God, inasmuch as in the beginning nothing was done by him, but without him were all things done which were done in the beginning. Wherefore in all reason we should stick to the known interpretation, in which every word receiveth its own proper signification without any figurative distortion, and is preserved in its due latitude and extension without any curtailing restriction. And therefore I conclude from the undeniable testimony of *S. John*, that in the beginning, when the Heavens and the earth and all the hosts of them were created, all things were made by the Word, who is *Christ Jesus* being made flesh; and consequently, by the method of Argument, as the Apostle antecedently by the method of Nature, that in the beginning *Christ* was. He then who was in Heaven and descended from thence before that which was begotten of the Virgin ascended thither, he who was before *John* the Baptist and before *Abraham*; he who was at the end of the first world, and at the beginning of the same; he had a real being and existence before *Christ* was conceived by the Virgin *Mary*. But all these we have already shewed belong unto the Son of God. Therefore we must acknowledge, that *Jesus Christ* had a real being and existence before he was begotten by the Holy Ghost: Which is our first Assertion, properly opposed to the * *Photinians*.

* The Photinians were Hereticks, so called from

Photinus, Bishop of Sirmium, but born in Gallogræcia, and Scholar to *Marcellus* Bishop of Ancyra. *Photinus* de Gallogræcia, *Marcelli* discipulus, *Sirmii* Episcopus ordinatus, *Hebionis* Hæresin instaurare conatus est. *S. Hieron. Catal. Eccl.* *Photinus* *Sirmienensis* Episcopus fuit à *Marcello* imbutus. Nam & *Diaconus* sub eo aliquandiu fuit. *Hilar. Fragm.* wherefore when *Epiphanius* speaketh thus of him, *ὅτις ὁμολογῶν τὸν Σιμῶνα*, it hath no relation to the original of his Person, but his Heresie; of which *S. Hilary*, *Pellicane*, natum *Jesum Christum* ex *Maria*, *Pannonia* defendit, *De Trin.* He was a man of singular parts and abilities. *ὅτις ἔχων ὁ λόγος, καὶ πείθειν ἰκανός*, says *Sozom.* l. 4. c. 6. *Γέγονε δ' ἔτος ὁ Φωτίνος λόγος τὸν πτόπον, καὶ ἀξυμμότος ἢ γλῶσσαν, πολλὰς δ' ὑμῶν ἀπαλὴν τῇ τῷ λόγῳ σεσημασμένη καὶ ἐτοιμολογία.* *Epiphani.* *Her.* 71. *Erat* & ingenii viribus valens, & doctrinæ opibus excellens, & eloquio præpotens, quippe qui utroque sermone copiose & graviter disputaret & scriberet. *Vincent. Lirin.* c. 16. He is said by some to follow the Heresie of *Ebion*. *Hebionis* Hæresin instaurare conatus est, says *S. Hierome.* and *S. Hilary* ordinarily understands him by the name of *Hebion*, and sometimes expounds himself, *Hebion*, qui est *Photinus*. But there is no similitude in their Doctrines, *Hebion* being more Jew then Christian, and teaching *Christ* as much begotten by *Joseph*, as born of *Mary*. *Philaster* will have him agree wholly with *Paulus* *Samosatenus* in omnibus, *Epiphanius* with an *ὁμοίως*, and *ἐπίμνητα*. *Socrates* and *Sozomen*, with him and with *Sabellius*: whereas he differed much from them both, especially from *Sabellius*, as being far from a *Patropassian*. *Marcellus* *Sabellianæ* hæresis assertor extiterat: *Photinus* vero novam hæresin jam ante protulerat, à *Sabellio* quidem in unionis diffinitione, sed initium *Christi* ex *Maria* prædicabat. *Severus* *Hist. Sac.* wherefore it will not be unnecessary to collect out of Antiquity what did properly belong unto *Photinus*, because I think it not yet done, and we find his Heresie in the propriety of it to begin and spread again. *Photinus*, mentis cæcitate deceptus, in *Christo* verum & substantiæ nostræ confessus est hominem, sed eundem *Deum* de *Deo* ante omnia secula genitum esse non credidit. *Leo de Nativ. Christi* *Serm.* 4. Ecce *Photinus* hominem tantum proficetur *Dei* Filium; dicit illum non fuisse ante beatam *Mariam*. *Lucifer* *Clarit.* Si quis in *Christo* sic veritatem prædicat animæ & carnis, ut veritatem in eo nolit accipere *Deitatis*, id est, qui sic dicit *Christum* hominem, ut *Deum* neget, non est *Christianus* *Carolicus*, sed *Photinianus* *Hæreticus*. *Fulg.* ad *Donat.* l. 16. *ὁμοίως* ἡλὸν ἀνθρώπου λέγει τὸν γενημένον, οὐδ' οὐ λέγων ὅτι τὸν τέκον, καὶ τὸν ἐκ μήτρας γεννηθέντα ἀνθρώπου καὶ οὐκ ὁμοίον Θεῷ. *Theodor. Homil. de Nativ. Ephes. Concil.* p. 3. c. 10. *Anathe-*

Anathematizamus Photinum, qui Hebionis Hæresim instaurans, Dominum Jesum Christum tantum ex Maria Virgine confiteatur. *Damascus Profess. Fidei.* Φάσκει ὁ ἅγιος, ἀπ' ἀρχῆς Χριστὸν μὴ ἦν, ἀπὸ τῆς Μαρίας καὶ ἀπὸ αὐτῆς γεννηθῆναι, ἐξ ὧν καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐπλάσθη ἐν αὐτῷ. καὶ ἐγέννηθη ἐκ Πλάμας ἁγίας. Epiphanius. Ἐλεγε δὲ ὁ Θεὸς μὴ εἶναι παρὰ τοῦτον εἰς ὃ ἐδίδετο λόγος τὰ πάντα δημιουργῆσαι. * ὁ δὲ πᾶσι αὐτῶν γινώσκοντες τὸ ὅτι ὁ Χριστὸς ἐκ τῆς ὁμοουσιᾶς, ἀλλ' ἐκ Μαρίας γεννηθῆναι τὴν Χριστὸν εἰσηγγίττω. Sozomen l. 4. c. 6. Photini ergo secta hæc est. Dicit Deum lingulum esse & solitarium, & more Judaico confitendum. Trinitatis plenitudinem negat, neque ullam Dei Verbi, aut ullam Spiritus Sancti putat esse personam. Christum vero hominem tantummodo solitarium asserit, cui principium adscribit ex Maria; & hoc omnibus modis dogmatizat, solam nos personam Dei Patris, & solum Christum hominem colere debere. *Vinc. Lincolnsis adv. Hæres. c. 17.* In the Disputation framed by Vigilinus out of the seventh Book of S. Hilary, as I conceive, Photinus rejecting the opinion of Sabellius (whom Socrates and Sozomen said he followed) as impious, thus declares his own: Unde magis ego dico, Deum Patrem Filium habere Dominum Jesum Christum, ex Maria Virgine initium sumentem, qui per sanctæ conversationis excellentissimum arque inimitabile beatitudinis meritum, à Deo Patre in Filium adoptatus & eximio Divinitatis honore donatus. and again; Ego Domino nostro Jesu Christo initium tribuo, purumque hominem fuisse affirmo, & per beatæ vitæ excellentissimum meritum Divinitatis honorem fuisse adeptum. *Vide eundem lib. 2. adv. Eutychen.* Ignorat etiam Photinus magnum pietatis, quod Apostolus memorat, sacramentum, qui Christi ex Virgine facetur exordium: Et propterea non credit sine initio substantialiter Deum natum ex Deo Patre, in quo carnis veritatem confiteatur ex Virgine. *Fulg. ad Thrasim. l. 1.* Greg. Nazianzen, according to his custom, gives a very brief, but remarkable, expression: Φάσκει τὸν κατὰ Χριστὸν καὶ ἀπὸ Μαρίας ἀρχαῖον. Orat. 26. But the opinion of Photinus cannot be better understood than by the Condemnation of it in the Council of Sirmium; which having set out the confession of their Faith in brief, addeth many and various Anathemas, according to the several Hæreses then apparent, without mentioning their names. Of these the fifth aims clearly at Photinus. Si quis secundum præscientiam vel prædestinationem ex Maria dicit filium esse, & non ante secula ex Patre natum, apud Deum esse, & per eum facta esse omnia, Anathema sit. *The 13. 14. and 15. also were particulars directed against him, as S. Hilary hath observed: but the last of all is most material.* Si quis Christum Deum, Filium Dei, ante secula subsistentem, & ministrantem Patri ad omnium perfectionem, non dicat, sed ex quo de Maria natus est, ex eo & Christum & Filium nominatum esse, & initium accepisse ut sit Deus, dicat, Anathema sit. upon which the observation of S. Hilary is this: Concludi damnatio ejus Hæresis propter quam conventum erat, (that is, the Photinian) expositione totius fidei cui adversabatur oportuit, quæ initium Dei Filii ex partu Virginis mentiebatur. S. Hilary, de Synod. contra Arianos. This was Photinus Bishop of Sirmium condemned by a Council held in the same City. They all agreed suddenly in the condemnation of him, Arians, Semi-Arians, and Catholics; καθεύδον εὐδοῖς, saies Socrates, καὶ τὸ τοῦ αἵματος καὶ δικαίου ὁμοῦ καὶ πάντες ἐπ' αὐτοῦ καὶ τότε καὶ ἐπ' αὐτὰ. l. 2. c. 29. And because his History is very obscure and intricate, take this brief Catalogue of his condemnations. He reads that he was condemned at the Council of Nice, and at the same time by a Council at Rome under Sylvester: but this is delivered only in a forged Epilogue Concilii Romani. He was then first condemned with Marcellus his Master, as Sulpitius Severus relates, probably by the Synod at Constantinople; for in that Marcellus was deprived. Sozomen. l. 2. c. 33. Socrates. l. 1. c. 36. Secondly, his Hærese is renounced in the second Synod at Antioch. Athanas. de Syn. Socrat. l. 1. c. 19. Thirdly, he was condemned in the Council of Sardes. Epiphanius, and Sulpitius Severus. Fourthly, by a Council at Milan. S. Hilary, Fragm. Fifthly, in a Synod at Sirmium he was deposed by the Western Bishops; but by reason of the great opinion and affection of the people he could not be removed. S. Hilary, Fragm. Sixthly, he was again condemned and deposed at Sirmium by the Eastern Bishops, and being convicted by Basil Bishop of Ancyra, was banished from thence. S. Hilary, Epiph. Socr. Sozom. Vigilinus. Indeed he was so generally condemned not only then, but afterwards under Valentinian, as S. Hierome testifies, and the Synodic Epistle of the Aquileian Council, that his opinion was soon worn out of the world. Ἡμεῖς δὲ καὶ καταδικάζομεν εἰς ἀβύσσον ἡρώων ἢ τότε καὶ ἡμετέριον αἵματος, saies Epiphanius, who lived not long after him. So suddenly was this opinion rejected by all Christians, applauded by none but Julian the Heretick, who vailed at S. John for making Christ God, and commended Photinus for denying it; as appears by an Epistle written by Julian unto him, as it is (though in a mean translation) delivered by Facundus. Tu quidem, O Photine, verisimilis videris, & proximus salvere, bene faciens nequaquam in utero inducere, quem credidisti Deum. *Facundus ad Justinian. l. 4.*

The second Assertion, next to be made good, is that the being which *Christ* had before he was conceived by the Virgin was not any created, but the Divine, essence, by which he always was truly, really and properly God. This will evidently and necessarily follow from the last demonstration of the first Assertion, the creating all things by the Son of God: from whence we inferred his pre-existence in the beginning assuring us as much that he was God, as that he was. For he that built all things is God. And the same Apostle which assures us *All things were made by him*, at the same time tells us, *In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.* Where *In the beginning* must not be denied unto the third proposition, because it cannot be denied unto the second. Therefore *in the beginning, or ever the earth was, the Word was God*, the same God with whom he was. For we cannot with any shew of reason either imagine that he was with one God, and was another, because there can be no more supreme Gods then one; or conceive that the Apostle should speak of one kind of God in the second, and of another in the third proposition; in the second, of a God eternall and independent, in the third, of a † made and depending God. Especially, first, considering that the eternall God was so constantly among the Jews called the

Heb. 3. 4.

Prov. 8. 23.

† And that upon so poor a ground as the want of an

Article, because in the first place it is *ὁ Θεός* & *Θεός*, in the second, *Θεός* *ὡς ὁ Λόγος*, not *ὁ Θεός* from hence to conclude, *ὁ Θεός* is one God, that is, *καὶ ὁ Θεός*, the supreme God, *Θεός* another, not the supreme, but one made God by him. Indeed they are beholden to Epiphanius for this observation, whose words are these: *Ἐὰν εἰπωμεν Θεός, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀρχαίου, τὴν τοῦ λόγου εἰπωμεν Θεόν ὡς ἱδνόμεν, ὁ Θεὸς τὸν ὄντα, (or rather ἐκ ὄντα) ἐὰν δὲ εἰπωμεν ὁ Θεός, δὴλον ὡς ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀρχαίου τὸν ὄντα (ἡμῶν καὶ αὐτῶν ἀλλοθι τε καὶ ἡμῶν καὶ αὐτῶν). Samaritan. Hæres. But whoever shall apply this rule to the sacred Scriptures will find it most fallacious. In the beginning*

ἐκινήσεται

ἐπίσταν ὁ Θεὸς τὴν ἐργασίαν καὶ τὴν γλῶσσαν, undoubtedly belongs to the true and supreme God: but it does not thence follow, that πνεῦμα Θεοῦ ἐπεσέειλε ἐπ' αὐτὸν τὸ ὑδάτιον, should be understood of the Spirit of another or inferior God. Certainly S. John, when he speaks of the Baptist, ἐγένετο ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἄγγελος παρὰ Θεοῦ, meant, he had his commission from heaven; and when it is spoken of Christ, ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν τέκνα Θεοῦ γενέσθαι, and again, ἐν Θεῷ ἐστὴν ὁ υἱός, it must be understood of the true God the Father. In the like manner, Θεὸν ὑδάτις ἐπέχευεν ποταμῶς, if it were taken τὸν ὄντως of any ever called God, any, even of Christ Jesus as man, it were certainly false. How can then any deny the Word to be the supreme God, because he is called simply Θεός, when S. John in the four next places, in which he speaketh of the supreme God, mentioneth him without an Article? This Criticism of theirs was first the observation of Asterius the Asian, Οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ μαρτυρῶν Πατὴρ Θεὸν κηρύσσων ὅτι τὸ Θεὸν δυνάμειν, ἢ τὸ Θεὸν (ορίαν, ἀλλὰ δὲ καὶ τὸν ἀποστόλῃν, δυνάμειν Θεοῦ, καὶ Θεοῦ (ορίαν. ἄλλω μὲν ἔστι ἵδιον αὐτῷ Θεῷ δυνάμειν ὅτι ἐκπορεύεται αὐτοῦ καὶ συνυπαρχέειν ἀχώρητως, κηρύσσων. These are the words of Asterius recorded by Athanasius Orat. 2. contra Arianos. In which place, notwithstanding, none can deny but Θεὸς is twice taken without an Article for the true and supreme God. Thus Didymus of Alexandria De Sp. S. would distinguish between the Person and the gift of the Holy Ghost, by the addition or defect of the Article. Apostoli quando intelligi volunt Personam Spiritus Sancti addunt Articulum, τὸ πνεῦμα, sine quo Spiritus Sancti donantur. And Athanasius objects against his adversaries denying the Holy Ghost to be God, that they produced places out of the Prophets to prove him a Creature, where πνεῦμα had not so much as an Article prefixed, which might give some colour to interpret it of the Holy Spirit. Οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐν τῷ ἀρχαίῳ ἐγγράφῳ τὸ παρὰ τὸν ἀρχαῖον τοῦ πνεύματος, ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ αὐτοὶ ἐγγράφῳ. Epist. ad Serapionem. Whereas we find in the same place of S. John, the same Spirit in the same sense mentioned with and without an Article. Ἐάν μὴ πνεῦμα ἔσται ὑδάτις καὶ πνεῦμα, John 3. 5. and, τὸ κηρύττον ἐν τῷ πνεύματι, v. 6. So 1 John 4. 1. Μὴ πνεῦμα πνεύματος πνεύματος, ἀλλὰ δοξαζέτε τὸ πνεῦμα. and again, Ἐν τῷ πνεύματι τῷ Θεῷ πᾶν πνεῦμα, &c. And beside, according to that distinction, τὸ πνεῦμα certainly stands for the gift of the Spirit, 1 Thess. 5. 19. τὸ πνεῦμα μὴ σβέννυτε. In the like manner, it is so far from truth that the Scriptures of serve so much the Articles, as to use ὁ Θεός always for the true and supreme God, and Θεός for the false or inferior; that where the true is expressly opposed to the false, even where he is styled simply Θεός. As, Ἀλλὰ τότε μὲν ἐκ εὐδοκίας Θεοῦ, ἐδούλωσε τοὺς μὴ εὐσεβεῖς υἱοὺς. Νῦν δὲ γινώσκεις Θεόν, μάλα καὶ ὁ γινώσκων καὶ Θεός. Gal. 4. 8, 9. And where the supreme is distinguished from him whom they make the inferior God, he is called likewise Θεός without an Article: as, ὁ Θεός. Ἰνὰ Χριστὸν, ἀφαισώμεθα εἰς ἐναγγέλιον Θεοῦ, and, τὸ θεοδικεῖν τὸν Θεόν ἐν δυνάμει, Rom. 1. 1, 4. Ἀπόστολος. Ἰνὰ Χριστὸν διὰ θελήματος Θεοῦ, 1 Cor. 1. 1. 2 Cor. 1. 1. Eph. 1. 1. Col. 1. 1. And if this distinction were good, our Saviour's argument to the Pharisees were not so: Εἰ δὲ ἐγὼ ἐν πνεύματι Θεοῦ ἐκείνου τὰ δαίμονια, ἀεὶ ἐρῶσιν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἢ βασιλεῖα τοῦ Θεοῦ. Matt. 12. 28. For it doth not follow, that if by the power of an inferior or false God he cast out Devils, that therefore the Kingdom of the true and supreme God is come upon them.

Word, the onely reason which we can conceive why the Apostle should thus use this phrase: and then observing the manner of S. John's writing, who rises strangely by degrees, making the last word of the former sentence the first of that which followeth: As, *In him was life, and the life was the light of men; and the light shineth in darkness, and the darkness comprehended it not: so, In the beginning was the Word, and the Word, which so was in the beginning, was with God, and the Word was God*; that is, the same God with whom the Word was in the beginning. But he could not be the same God with him any other way, then by having the same Divine essence. Therefore the being which Christ had before he was conceived by the Virgin was the Divine nature, by which he was properly and really God.

Secondly, He who was subsisting in the form of God, and thought himself to be equal with God, (in which thought he could not be deceived, nor be injurious to God) must of necessity be truly and essentially God: because there can be no equality between the Divine essence, which is infinite, and any other whatsoever, which must be finite. But this is true of Christ, and that antecedently to his Conception in the Virgin's womb, and existence in his humane nature. For, *being (or rather † subsisting) in the form of God, he thought it not robbery to be equal with God: But emptied himself, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men.* Out of which words naturally result three Propositions fully demonstrating our Assertion. First, That Christ was in the form of a servant as soon as he was made man. Secondly, That he was in the form of God before he was in the form of a servant. Thirdly, That he was in the form of God, that is, did as truly and really subsist in the Divine nature, as in the form of a servant, or in the nature of man. It is a vain imagination, that our Saviour then first appeared a servant when he was apprehended, bound, scourged, crucified. For they were not all slaves which ever suffered such indignities, or died that death; and when they did, their death did not make, but find them, or suppose them servants. Beside, our Saviour in all the degrees of his humiliation never lived as a servant unto any Master on earth. 'Tis true, at first he was subject, but as a Son, to his reputed Father & undoubted

Phil. 2. 6, 7.
† In effigie
Dei constitutus.
Tertul.
In figura Dei
constitutus.
Cyp.

Rom. 8. 3.

Gal. 4. 4.

1st. 53. 2. 3.

* Ἀν' ἑαυτὸν
ἐκένωσεν,
μορφῇ
θεοῦ λα-
βὼν, ἐν
ὁμοιωματι
ἀνθρώπων
ἡυδαίσε.
which is also
exactly ob-
served by
the Vulgar
Latine, Sed
semetipsum
exinanivit,
formam ser-
vi accipiens,
in similitu-
dine homi-
num factus.
where ἡυ-
δαίσε is ad-
ded by appo-
sition to λα-
βὼν, and
have both
equal relati-
on to ἐκέν-
ωσεν, or,
which is all
one, ἐκένω-
σεν λαβὼν,
ἔλαβε
ἡυδαίσε.
Phil. 2. 8.
† Ἐταπεί-
νωσεν ἑαυ-
τὸν, ἡυδαίσε καὶ ὡς ἄνθρωπος.
For in both these verses there is but one conjunction, joyning together two acts of our Saviour,
his first exinanition, or ἐκένωσεν, and his farther humiliation, or ἔταπείνωσεν: the rest are all participles added for expli-
cation to the Verbs. b Psal. 40. 6. c Exod. 21. 6. Deut. 15. 17.

doubted Mother. When he appeared in publick, he lived after the manner of a Prophet, and a Doctour sent from God, accompanied with a Family, as 'twere, of his Apostles, whose Master he professed himself, subject to the commands of no man in that Office, and obedient onely unto God. The form then of a servant which he took upon him must consist in something distinct from his sufferings, or submission unto men; as the condition in which he was when he so submitted and so suffered. In that he was made flesh, sent in the likeness of sinfull flesh, subject unto all infirmities and miseries of this life attending on the sons of men fallen by the sin of Adam: in that he was made of a woman, made under the law, and so obliged to perform the same; which Law did so handle the children of God, as that they differed nothing from servants: in that he was born, bred, and lived in a mean, low and abject condition; as a root out of a drie ground, he had no form nor comeliness, and when they saw him, there was no beauty that they should desire him; but was despised and rejected of men, a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief: In that he was thus made man, he took upon him the form of a servant. Which is not mine, but the Apostle's explication; as adding it not by way of conjunction, in which there might be some diversity, but by way of apposition, which signifieth a clear identity. And therefore it is necessary to observe, that our translation of that verse is not onely not exact, but very disadvantageous to that truth which is contained in it. For we read it thus; *He made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men.* Where we have two copulative conjunctions, neither of which is in the * original text, and three distinct propositions, without any dependence of one upon the other; whereas all the words together are but an expression of Christ's exinanition, with an explication shewing in what it consisteth: which will clearly appear by this literal translation, *But emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men.* Where if any man doubt how Christ emptied himself, the text will satisfie him, by taking the form of a servant; if any still question how he took the form of a servant, he hath the Apostle's resolution, by being made in the likeness of men. Indeed after the expression of this exinanition, he goes on with a conjunction, to add another act of Christ's humiliation; *And being found in fashion as a man, being already by his exinanition in the form of a servant, or the likeness of men, he humbled himself, and became (or rather, † becoming,) obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.* As therefore his humiliation consisted in his obedience unto death, so his exinanition consisted in the assumption of the form of a servant, and that in the nature of man. All which is very fitly expressed by a strange interpretation on the Epistle to the Hebrews. For whereas these words are clearly in the Psalmist, *Sacrifice and offering thou didst not desire, mine ears hast thou opened:* the Apostle appropriateth the sentence to Christ; *When he cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared me.* Now being the † boaring of the ear under the Law was a note of perpetuall servitude, being this was expressed in the words of the Psalmist, and changed by the Apostle into the preparing of a body; it followeth, that when Christ's body first was framed, even then did he assume the form of a servant.

Again

Again, it appeareth out of the same Text, that *Christ* was in the form of God before he was in the form of a servant, and consequently before he was made man. For he which is presupposed to be, and to think of that being which he hath, and upon that thought to assume, must have that being before that assumption: but *Christ* is first expressly said to be in the form of God, and, being so, to think it no robbery to be equal with God, and, notwithstanding that equality, to take upon him the form of a servant: therefore it cannot be denied but he was before in the form of God. Beside, he was not in the form of a servant but by the emptying himself, and all exinanition necessarily presupposeth a precedent plenitude; it being as impossible to empty any thing which hath no fulness, as to fill any thing which hath no emptiness. But the fulness which *Christ* had, in respect whereof assuming the form of a servant he is said to empty himself, could be in nothing else but in the form of God, in which he was before. Wherefore, if the assumption of the form of a servant be contemporary with his exinanition; if that exinanition necessarily presupposeth a plenitude as indispensably antecedent to it; if the form of God be also coeval with that precedent plenitude: then must we confess, *Christ* was in the form of God before he was in the form of a servant: which is the second Proposition.

Again, it is as evident from the same Scripture, that *Christ* was as much in the form of God as the form of a servant, and did as really subsist in the Divine nature as in the nature of man. For he was so *in the form of God*, as thereby to be ^{*}equal with God. But no other form beside the essential, which is the Divine nature it self, could infer an equality with God. ^aTo whom will ye liken me, and make me equal? saith the Holy One. There can be but one infinite, eternall and independent Being; and there can be no comparison between that and whatsoever is finite, temporal, and depending. He therefore who did truly think himself equal with God, as being in the form of God, must be conceived to subsist in that one infinite, eternall and independent nature of God. Again, the phrase, *in the form of God*, not elsewhere mentioned, is used by the Apostle with a respect unto that other, of the *form of a servant*, exgetically continued *in the likeness of man*; and the respect of one unto the other is so necessary, that if the form of God be not as real and essential as the form of a servant, or the likeness of man, there is no force in the Apostle's words, nor will his argument be fit to work any great degree of humiliation upon the consideration of *Christ's* exinanition. But by the *form* is certainly understood the true condition of a servant, and by the *likeness* infallibly meant the real nature of man: nor doth the *fashion* in which he was found destroy, but rather assert, the truth of his Humanity. And therefore, as sure as *Christ* was really and essentially man, of the same nature with us, in whose similitude he was made; so certainly was he also really and essentially God, of the same nature and being with him, in whose form he did subsist. Seeing then we have clearly evinced from the express words of S. Paul, that *Christ* was in the form of a servant as soon as he was made man, that he was

* Τὸ ἴδιον
Θεῷ. Patriari
Deo, Tertull.
Esse se aqua-
lem Deo,
Cypri. Esse x-
qualis Deo,
Leporius. Thus
all express the
notion of E-
quality, not of
Similitude: nor
can we under-
stand any less
by τὸ ἴδιον,
then τὸ ὅμοι-
ον, ἴσον and
ἴδιον being in-
differently u-
sed by the
Greeks, as
Pindarus
Olymp.
ode 2.
ἴσον δὲ νό-
μιμον αἰεί,
ἴσα δὲ ἐν ἀ-
μείναις ἀλι-
ον ἐχέμεν, ἀ-
πένεστον
Ἑσλοὶ νέ-
μοισιν βίβλον.

So whom the Greeks call ἴσοθεον, Homer ἴσα Θεῷ, Odys. O.

Τὸν νῦν ἴσα Θεῷ Ἰδαχιστοὶ ἐπισέβοντο.

where ἴσα has not the nature of an Adverb, as belonging to ἐπισέβοντο, but of a Noun referred to the antecedent Τὸν, or including an Adverb added to a Noun, τὸν νῦν ὡς ἴσοθεον. The collection of Grotius from this verse is very strange; ἴδιον Θεῷ, est spectari tanquam Deum. As if he should have said, ἐπισέβοντο signifies spectant, therefore ἴδιον signifies spectari. This he was forced to put off thus, because the strength of our interpretation, rendering an equality, lies in the Verb substantive τὸ ἴδιον. As Dionysius of Alexandria very anciently, καὶ ὡς αὐτὸν, καὶ ταπεινῶς ὡς Δαυὶδ, Δαυὶδ δὲ σαυῶν, ἴσα Θεῷ ἐστέ. Epist. ad Paulum Samosat. For we acknowledge that ἴσα by it self oft-times signifieth no more then inquit, and so inferreth nothing but a similitude: as we find it frequently in the book of Job, where it sometimes answereth to the inseparable particle כִּי as כִּי לַיְלָה, quasi in nocte, ἴσα νυκτὶ, 5. 14. כְּנִבְרָה, sicut

sicut caseum, ἵσα τυρῶν, 10. 10. כֶּרֶק, quasi putredo, Sym. ὁμοίως σαρκοῦ, LXX ἵσα ἀσπῶ, 13. 28. כֶּמֶס, sicut aquam, ἵσα ποτῶ, 15. 16. צֶעַד, tanquam lignum, ἵσα ξύλων, 24. 20. כֹּחֶמֶר, sicut lutum, ἵσα πηλῶ, 27. 16. כֶּמְעִיר, sicut vestimento, ἵσα ὑμῶν, 29. 14. כֶּבֶקֶר, quasi bos, ἵσα βοῶν, 40. 15. Where we see the Vulgar Latine meth for the Hebrew כ, quasi, sicut, tanquam, the LXX ἵσα. Sometime it answereth to no word in the Original, but supplieth a similitude, understood, not expressed, in the Hebrew: as וְיָרִי, tanquam pullum, ἵσα ὄνυ, 11. 12. וְאֶבֶן, & lapis, ἵσα λίθῶ, 28. 2. כֹּחֶמֶר, luto, ἵσα πηλῶ, 30. 19. Once it readeth an Hebrew word rather according to the intention, then the signification; מִשְׁלִי אֶפֶר, comparabitur cineris, ad e. b. m., proverb. cineris, ἵσα σπυ, 13. 12. So that in all these places it is used adverbially for instar, and in none hath the addition of כִּי to it. As for that answer of Socinus, that Christ cannot be God, because he is said to be equal with God, Tantum abest ut ab eo quod Christus sit æqualis Deo sequatur ipsum esse æternū & summum Deum, ut potius ex hoc ipso necessario consequatur non esse æternū & summū Deum. Nemo enim sibi ipsi æqualis esse potest, Soc. ad S. c. Wick. as if there could be no predication of equality where we find a *sancta nial* identity: it is most certainly false, because the most exact speakers use such language as this is. There can be no expressions more exact and pertinent than those which are used by Geometricians, neither can there be any better judges of equality than they are; but they most frequently use that expression in this notion, proving an equality and inferring it from identity. As in the fifth Proposition of the first Element of Euclide, two lines are said to contain an angle equal to the angle contained by two other lines, because they contained the same angle, or γωνίᾳ κοινῇ, and the basis of one triangle is supposed equal to the basis of another triangle, because the same line was basis to both, or βάσις κοινῇ. In the same manner certainly may the Son be said to be equal to the Father in essence or power, because they both have the same essence and power, that is, ὁμοίως καὶ ὁμοῦ μὲν κοινῇ. Ocellus de Universo, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ τοῦ ταυτοῦ ἐκείνου ἀναγίνεται καὶ ἵσον καὶ ὁμοῖον αὐτῷ αὐτῷ. p. 11. * If a. 40. 25. and 46. 5.

in the form of God before he was in the form of a servant, that the form of God in which he subsisted doth as truly signify the Divine, as the likeness of man the humane nature; it necessarily followeth, that Christ had a real existence before he was begotten of the Virgin, and that the being which he had was the Divine essence, by which he was truly, really, and properly God.

Thirdly, He which is expressly styled Alpha and Omega, the first and the last, without any restriction or limitation; as he is after, so was before any time assignable, truly and essentially God. For by this title God describeth his own being, and distinguisheth it from all other. *I the Lord, the first, and with the last, I am he. I am he, I am the first, I also am the last. I am the first, and I am the last, and beside me there is no God.* But Christ is expressly called Alpha and Omega, the first and the last. He so proclaimed himself by a great voice, as of a trumpet, saying, *I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last.* Which answereth to that solemn call and proclamation in the Prophet, *Hearken unto me, O Jacob, and Israel my called.* He comforteth S. John with the majesty of this title, *Fear not, I am the first and the last.* Which words were spoken by one like unto the Son of man; by him that liveth, and was dead, and is alive for evermore; that is, undoubtedly, by Christ. He upholdeth the Church of Smyrna in her tribulation by virtue of the same description, *These things saith the first and the last, which was dead, and is alive.* He ascertaineth his coming unto Judgment with the same assertion, *I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last.* And in all these places this Title is attributed unto Christ absolutely and universally, without any kind of restriction or limitation, without any assignation of any particular in respect of which he is the first or last; in the same latitude and * eminence of expression in which it is or can be attributed to the supreme God. There is yet another Scripture in which the same description may seem of a more dubious interpretation: * *I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty.* For being it is the Lord who so calls himself, which title belongeth to the Father and the Son, it may be doubted whether it be spoken by the Father or the Son; but whether it be understood of the one or of the other, it will sufficiently make good what we intend to prove. For if they be understood of Christ, as the precedent and the following words imply, then is he certainly that Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty; that is, the su-

J. 4. 4. 4.

43. 12.

44. 6.

Rev. 1. 11.

J. 4. 48. 12.

Rev. 1. 17.

13. 18.

2. 8.

Rev. 22. 13.

* With the Article, so much else-where stood upon, τὸ α καὶ τὸ ω, ὁ ἀρχὴ καὶ τὸ τέλος, The Alpha & the Omega, the first and the last. For we must not take τὸ α as the Grammarians do, by which they signify only the letter written in that figure, and called by that name. As appeareth by Eratosthenes, who was called Βῆτα, not τὸ βήτα, as Suidas corruptly. Hesychius Illustris, from whom Suidas had that passage; Ἐγκαδοῦς δὲ τὸ δέλεον πῶς ἐστὶν μαρτυρεῖται τοῖς ἄλλοις ἐγγράφοις, Βῆτα ἐκλήθη. And Marianns Hieracleota in Periplo, καὶ μὴ ἐκείνῳ Ἐγκαδοῦς, ὅτι Βῆτα ἐστὶν ἀπὸ τοῦ τὸ Μῆτα ὡς καὶ ἵσα.

1. 8.

preme

preme eternall God, of the same Divine essence with the Father, who was before described by *him which is, and which was, and which is to come*, to whom the six-wing'd Beasts continually cry, *Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty, which was, and is, and is to come*; as the familiar explication of that name which God revealed to *Moses*. If they belong unto the supreme God, the Father of our Lord *Jesus Christ*; then did he so describe himself unto *S. John*, and express his supreme Deity, that by those words, *I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending*, he might be known to be the one Almighty and eternal God: and consequently, whosoever should assume that title, must attribute as much unto himself. Wherefore being *Christ* hath so immediately, and with so great solemnity and frequency, taken the same style upon him by which the Father did express his Godhead; it followeth, that he hath declared himself to be the supreme, almighty, and eternall God. And being thus the Alpha and the first, he was before any time assignable, and consequently before he was conceived of the Virgin; and the being which then he had was the Divine essence, by which he was truly and properly the almighty and eternall God.

Rev. 1. 4.

Rev. 4. 3.

Exod. 3. 14.

Fourthly, He whose glory *Isaiah* saw in the year that King *Uzziah* died had a being before *Christ* was begotten of the Virgin, and that being was the Divine essence, by which he was naturally and essentially God: For he is expressly called *the Lord, Holy, holy, holy, the Lord of Hosts, whose glory filleth the whole earth*; which titles can belong to none beside the one and only God. But *Christ* was he whose glory *Isaiah* saw, as *S. John* doth testify, saying, *These things said Esaias, when he saw his glory, and spake of him*: and he whose glory he saw, and of whom he spake, was certainly *Christ*; for of him the Apostle treateth in that place, and of none but him. *These things spake Jesus, and departed. But though he (that is, Jesus) had done so many miracles before them, yet they believed not on him*, that is, *Christ*, who wrought those miracles. The reason why they believed not on him was, *That the saying of Esaias the Prophet might be fulfilled, which he spake, Lord, who hath believed our report?* And as they did not, so they could not believe in *Christ*, because that *Esaias* said again, *He hath blinded their eyes and hardned their hearts; that they should not see with their eyes, nor understand with their hearts, and be converted, and I should heal them*. For those who God foresaw, and the Prophet foretold, should not believe, could not do it without contradicting the prescience of the one, and the predictions of the other. But the *Jews* refusing to assent unto the Doctrine of our Saviour were those of whom the Prophet spake: For *these things said Esaias when he saw his glory, and spake of him*. Now if the glory which *Isaias* saw were the glory of *Christ*, and he of whom *Isaias* in that Chapter spake were *Christ* himself; then must those blinded eyes and hardned hearts belong unto these *Jews*, and then their Infidelity was so long since foretold. Thus doth the fixing of that Prophecie upon that people, which saw our Saviour's miracles, depend upon *Isaiah's* Vision, and the appropriation of it unto *Christ*. Wherefore *S. John* infallibly hath taught us, that the Prophet saw the glory of *Christ*; and the Prophet hath as undoubtedly assured us, that he whose glory then he saw was the one omnipotent and eternall God; and consequently both together have sealed this truth, that *Christ* did then subsist in that glorious majesty of the eternall Godhead.

Isa. 6. 1, 3.

John 12. 41.

36.

37.

38.

39.

40.

41.

Lastly, He who, being man, is frequently in the Scriptures called God, and that in such a manner, as by that name no other can be understood but the one only and eternall God, he had an existence before he was made man, and the being which then he had was no other then the Divine essence; because all novelty is repugnant to the Deity, nor can any be that one God, who was

not so from all eternity. But *Jesus Christ*, being in the nature of man, is frequently in the sacred Scriptures called God; and that name is attributed unto him in such a manner, as by it no other can be understood but the one Almighty and eternall God.

Which may be thus demonstrated. It hath been already proved, and we all agree in this, that there can be but one Divine essence, and so but one supreme God. Wherefore were it not said in the Scriptures, there are *many Gods*; did not he himself who is supreme call others so; we durst not give that name to any but to him alone, nor could we think any called God to be any other but that one. It had been then enough to have alledged that *Christ* is God, to prove his supreme and eternall Deity: whereas now we are answered, that there are Gods many, and therefore it followeth not from that name that he is the one eternall God. But if *Christ* be none of those many Gods, and yet be God, then can he be no other but that one. And that he is not to be numbred with them, is certain, because he is clearly distinguished from them, and opposed to them. We reade in the Psalmist, *I have said ye are Gods, and all of you are children of the most High*. But we must not reckon *Christ* among those Gods, we must not number the onely-begotten Son among those children. For *they knew not, neither would they understand, they walked on in darknes*: and whosoever were Gods onely as they were, either did, or might doe so. Whereas *Christ*, in whom alone dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead bodily, is not onely distinguished from, but opposed to, such Gods as those, by his Disciple's saying, *Now we are sure that thou knowest all things*; by himself proclaiming, *I am the light of the world: he that followeth me shall not walk in darknes*. S. Paul hath told us *there be gods many, and lords many*; but withall hath taught us, that to us there is but one God, the Father, and one Lord *Jesus Christ*. In which words, as the Father is opposed as much unto the many Lords as many Gods, so is the Son as much unto the many Gods as many Lords; the Father being as much Lord as God, and the Son as much God as Lord. Wherefore being we find in Scripture frequent mention of one God, and beside that one an intimation of many Gods, and whosoever is called God must either be that one, or one of those many; being we find our blessed Saviour to be wholly opposed to the many Gods, and consequently to be none of them, and yet we reade him often styled God: it followeth, that that name is attributed unto him in such a manner, as by it no other can be understood but the one Almighty and eternall God.

Again, those who deny our Saviour to be the same God with the Father have invented rules to be the touchstone of the eternall power and Godhead. First, where the name of God is taken absolutely, as the subject of any proposition, it always signifieth the supreme power and Majesty, excluding all others from that Deity. Secondly, where the same name is any way used with an Article by way of excellency, it likewise signifieth the same supreme Godhead as admitting others to a communion of Deity, but excluding them from the Supremacy. Upon these two rules they have raised unto themselves this Observation, That whensoever the name of God absolutely taken is placed as the subject of any proposition, it is not to be understood of *Christ*: and wheresoever the same name is spoken of our Saviour by way of predicate, it never hath an Article denoting excellency annexed to it; and consequently leaves him in the number of those Gods who are excluded from the Majesty of the eternall Deity.

Now though there can be no kind of certainty in any such observations of the Articles, because the *Greeks* promiscuously often use them or omit them, without any reason of their usurpation or omission, (whereof examples are

are innumerable;) though, if those rules were granted, yet would not their Conclusion follow, because the supreme God is often named (as they confess) without an Article, and therefore the same name may signifie the same God when spoken of *Christ*, as well as when of the Father, so far as can concern the omission of the Article: yet, to complete my demonstration, I shall shew, first, that the name of God taken subjectively is to be understood of *Christ*; secondly, that the same name with the Article affixed is attributed unto him; thirdly, that if it were not so, yet where the Article is wanting, there is that added to the predicate which hath as great a virtue to signifie that excellency as the Article could have.

S. Paul, unfolding the mystery of Godliness, hath delivered six Propositions together, and the subject of all and each of them is God. *Without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifested in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of Angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory.* And this God which is the subject of all these Propositions must be understood of *Christ*, because of him each one is true, and all are so of none but him. He was the Word which was God, and was made flesh, and consequently *God manifested in the flesh*. Upon him the Spirit descended at his Baptism, and after his Ascension was poured upon his Apostles, ratifying his Commission, and confirming the Doctrine which they received from him: wherefore he was *God justified in the Spirit*. His Nativity the Angels celebrated, in the discharge of his Office they ministred unto him, at his Resurrection and Ascension they were present, always ready to confess and adore him: he was therefore *God seen of Angels*. The Apostles preached unto all Nations, and he whom they preached was ^a *Jesus Christ*. The Father ^b separated S. Paul from his mother's womb, and called him by his grace, to reveal his Son unto him, that he might preach him among the heathen: therefore he was *God preached unto the Gentiles*. John the Baptist spake ^c unto the people, that they should believe on him which should come after him, that is, on *Christ Jesus*. ^d We have believed in *Jesus Christ*, saith S. Paul, who so taught the Gaolour trembling at his feet, ^e Believe in the Lord *Jesus Christ*, and thou shalt be saved: he therefore was *God believed on in the world*. When he had been forty days on earth after his Resurrection, he was taken visibly up into Heaven, and sat down at the right hand of the Father: wherefore he was *God received up into glory*. And thus all these six Propositions, according to the plain and familiar language of the Scriptures, are infallibly true of *Christ*, and so of God, as he is taken by S. John, when he speaks those words, *the Word was God*. But all these cannot be understood of any other, which either is, or is called, God. For though we grant the Divine perfections and attributes to be the same with the Divine essence, yet are they never in the Scriptures called God; nor can any of them with the least shew of probability be pretended as the subject of these propositions, or afford any tolerable interpretation. When they tell us that *God*, that is, the ^{*} Will of God, was manifested in the flesh, that is, was revealed by frail and mortal men, and received up in glory, that is, [†] was received gloriously on earth, they teach us a language which the [†] Scriptures know not, and the Holy Ghost never used. And as no

1 Tim. 3. 16.

^a Acts 8. 5, 35.

9. 20. 11. 20.

17. 3, 18. 19.

13.

Rom. 16. 25.

2 Cor. 1. 19.

11. 4.

Phil. 1. 18.

^b Gal. 1. 15,

16.

^c Acts 19. 4.^d Gal. 2. 16.^e Acts 16. 31.

* Deus, i.e. voluntas ipsius de servandis hominibus, per locum infirmos & mor-

tales perfectè parafacta est, &c. Catech. Racov. ad Quest. 59.

† For Οὗτος is not δέχνημα. Οὗτος, much less is ἀνελήφθαι received or embraced. Elias speaketh not of his reception, but his ascension, when he saith to Elisha, Τί ποιῶσαι σοι περὶ ἡ ἀναληφθῆναι ἀπὸ σοῦ, 2 Kings 2. 9. and, Εὐὺν ἰδὺς με ἀναγαμὶν καὶ ἀνελήφθαι ἀπὸ σοῦ, & ἔπειτα σοι ἔσται. When he actually ascended, as the Original עָלָה, it is no otherwise translated by the Septuagint, then ἀναλήφθαι. Ἐλὺς ἐν Κνωστοῦ ὡς εἰς τὸν ὕδαν. which language was preserved by the Hellenizing Jews: Οὐδὲ ἀνελήφθαι ἐν λαίλαπι πνεύματος, Sirac. 48. 9. and again, ἀναλήφθαι ὡς εἰς τὸν ὕδαν, 1 Mac. 2. 58. Neither did they use it of Elias only, but of Enoch also. Οὗτος ἐκπύθη οἱ Θεοὶ ὁ Ἐνώχ, & ὁ αὐτὸς ἀνελήφθαι ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς. The same language is continued in the new Testament of our Saviour's Ascension, ἀνελήφθαι εἰς τὸν ὕδαν, Mar. 16. 19. ὁ ἀναληφθεὶς ἀπὸ ὑμῶν εἰς τὸν ὕδαν, Acts 1. 11. and singly, ἀνελήφθαι, Acts 1. 2. and ἀνελήφθαι ἀπὸ ἡμῶν, Acts 1. 22. As therefore ἀνδάντης τὸ Μωσῆς, in the language of the Jews, was not the reception of Moses

doles by the Israelites, but the assumption of his body; so ἀνάληψις τοῦ Χριστοῦ is the Assumption of Christ, Luke 9. 51. Wherefore this being the constant notion of the word, it must so be here likewise understood, ἀνελήφθη ἐν ἑλῆν· as the Vulgar Latine, (whose authority is pretended against us,) assumptum est in gloria; rendering it here by the same word by which he always translated ἀνελήφθη.

Attribute, so no person but the Son can be here understood under the name of God: not the Holy Ghost, for he is distinguished from him, as being justified by the Spirit; not the Father, who was not manifested in the flesh, nor received up in glory. It remaineth therefore that, whereas the Son is the only Person to whom all these clearly and undoubtedly belong, which are here joyntly attributed unto God, as sure as the name of God is expressed universally in the * Copies of the Original language, so thus absolutely and subjectively taken must it be understood of Christ.

* For being the Epistle was written in the Greek

Language, it is enough if all those Copies do agree. Nor need we be troubled with the observation of Grotius on the place: Suspectam nobis hanc lectionem faciunt Inie pretes veteres, Latinus, Syrus, Arabs & Ambrosius, qui omnes legerunt θεογενεσθαι. I confess the Vulgar Latine reads it otherwise than the Greek, Quod manifestum est in carne; and it cannot be denied but the Syriac, however translated by Tremellius, agreeth with the Latine; and both seem to have read εἰς, instead of Θεός. But the joint consent of the Greek Copies and Interpreters are above the authority of those two Translations; and the Arabick set forth in the Biblia Polyglotta agreeth expressly with them. But that which Grotius hath further observed is of far greater consideration: Addit Hincmarus opusculo 55. illud Θεός hic positum à Nestorianis. For if at first the Greeks read θεογενεσθαι, and that εἰς were altered into Θεός by the Nestorians; then ought we to correct the Greek Copy by the Latine, and confess there is not only no force, but not so much as any ground or colour for our Argument. But first, it is no way provable that the Nestorians should find it in the Original εἰς, and make it Θεός, because that by so doing they had overturned their own Assertion, which was, that God was not incarnate, nor born of the Virgin Mary; that God did not ascend unto Heaven, but Christ by the Holy Ghost remaining upon him, καὶ τὸ ἀνάληψιν αὐτοῦ χειροτονῶν. Concil. Ephes. part. 1. cap. 17. Secondly, it is certain that they did not make this alteration, because the Catholick Greeks read it Θεός before there were such Hereticks, so called. Nestoriani à Nestorio Episcopo, Patriarcha Constantinopolitano. Aug. Hæres. Nestorius, from whom that Heresie began, was Patriarch of Constantinople after Sisinnius, Sisinnius after Atticus, Atticus after Nestorius, who succeeded Joannes, vulgarly called Chrysostomus. But S. Chrysostome read not εἰς, but Θεός, as appears by his Commentaries upon the place; Θεός ἐγενεσθαι ἐν Καρπῷ, τοτέστιν, ὁ δαμνικός. And S. Cyrill, who by all means opposed Nestorius upon the first appearance of his Heresie, wrote two large Epistles to the Queens Pulcheria and Eudocia, in both which he maketh great use of this Text. In the first, after the repetition of the words as they are now in the Greek Copies, he proceedeth thus: Τίς δὲ ἐν Καρπῷ γενεσθαι εἰς δὲ ἄλλον, ἐπὶ πάντων καὶ πάντως ὁ ἐν Θεῷ πατρὶς λόγος· ἔγω γὰρ ἔστω μέγα τὸ εὐσεβείας μυστήριον, Θεός ἐγενεσθαι ἐν Καρπῷ. Wherefore in S. Paul he read Θεός God, and took that God to be the word. In the second, repeating the same text verbatim, he manageth it thus against Nestorius: Εἰ Θεός ὦν ὁ λόγος ἐνανθρωπῶντος λέγεται, καὶ ὁ ἄλλος μάλιστα τὸ εἶ Θεός, ἀλλ' ἐν οἷς λέγεται αὐτὸν διαμένον, μέγα δὲ τότε καὶ ὁμοιωμένους μέγα ἐστὶ τὸ εὐσεβείας μυστήριον. ἐν δὲ ἀνθρώπῳ νοῦται κοινὸς ὁ Χριστός, πῶς ἐν Καρπῷ περὶ ἑαυτοῦ καὶ καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ἀπαιεῖται, ἐπὶ αὐτῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐν Καρπῷ τε ἐστὶ, καὶ ἐν ἑτέρῳ ὁρώμενος; And in the explanation of his second Anathematism he maketh use of no other Text but this to prove the Hypothetical Union, giving it this gloss or exposition: Τί ἐστὶ τὸ ἐγενεσθαι ἐν Καρπῷ; τὸτέστιν, ὅτι ἐν Θεῷ πατρὶς λόγος, &c. The same he useth in his Scholion de Unigeniti Incarnatione. So also Theodoret contemporary with S. Cyrill: Θεός γὰρ ὦν καὶ Θεὸς υἱός, καὶ ἀόρατος ἔχων τὴν οὐσίαν, διὰ τοῦ ἀπαιεῖται ἐνανθρωπῶντος ἐγένετο, σαφὲς γὰρ ἡμῶς δὲ οὕτως ἐδείχθη, ἐν Καρπῷ γὰρ τὸ πῶς εἶναι ἐγενεσθαι αὐτοῦ φύσιν. Thirdly, Hincmarus does not say that the Nestorians put Θεός into the Greek text, but that he which put it in was cast out of his Bishoprick for a Nestorian. His words are these: Quidam nimirum ipsas Scripturas verbis illicitis imposturaverunt; sicut Macedonius Constantinopolitanus Episcopus, qui ab Anastasio Imperatore ideo à Civitate expulsiis legitur, quoniam falsavit Evangelia, et illum Apostoli locum ubi dicitur, quod apparuit in carne, justificationem est in Spiritu per cognitionem Græcarum literarum O in Θ hoc modo mutando falsavit. Ubi enim habuit Θ, hoc est OZ monosyllabum Græcum, litera mutata O in Θ vertit, et fecit ΘΣ, id est ut esset, Deus apparuit per carnem. Quapropter tanquam Nestorianus fuit expulsiis. Hinc. Opusc. 55. c. 18. Now whereas Hincmarus says expulsiis legitur, we read not in Eutychius, or the Excerpta of Theodorus, or in Joannes Malala, that Macedonius was cast out of his Bishoprick for any such falsification. It is therefore probable that he had it from Liberatus, a Deacon of the Church of Carthage, who wrote a History, collected partly out of the Ecclesiasticall Histories and Acts of the Councils, partly out of the relations of such men as he thought fit to believe, extant in the fourth Tome of the Councils. In which, chap. 19. we have the same relation, only with this difference, that O is not turned into Θ but into Ω; and so OΣ becomes not ΘΣ, but ΩΣ. So that first the Greek Copies are not said to have read it εἰς, but εἰς, and so not to have relation to the mystery, but to the person of Christ; and therefore this makes nothing for the Vulgar Latine. Secondly, whereas Hincmarus says there was but one letter charged, no such mutation can of OΣ make ΘΕΟΣ, it may ΩΣ, as we read in Liberatus; and then this is nothing to the Greek Text. Thirdly, Macedonius was no Nestorian, but Anastasius an Eutychian, and he ejected him as he did other Catholick Bishops under the pretence of Nestorianism, but for other reasons. Howsoever Macedonius could not falsify all the Greek Copies, neither as well those which were before his time as those which were written since all acknowledge Θεός. And if he had been ejected for substituting Θεός, without question Anastasius would have taken care for the restoring εἰς, which we find not in any Copy. It remaineth therefore that the Nestorians did not falsify the Text by reading Θεός ἐγενεσθαι, but that the ancient Greek Fathers read it so; and consequently, being the Greek is the Original, this Lesson must be acknowledged Authentick.

Acts 20. 28.

Again, S. Paul speaketh thus to the Elders of the Church of Ephesus; Take heed unto your selves, and to all the flock over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the Church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood. In these words this doctrinal Proposition is clearly contained, God hath purchased the Church with his own blood. For there is no other word either in or near the Text which can by any Grammatical construction be joyned with the Verb, except the Holy Ghost, to whom the Predicate is repugnant, both in respect of the act, or our Redemption, and of the means, the Blood.

Bloud. If then the Holy Ghost hath not purchased the Church; if he hath not bloud to shed for our Redemption, and *without bloodshed there is no remission*; if there be no other word to which, according to the literal construction, the act of purchasing can be applied; if the name of God, most frequently joyned to his * Church, be immediately and properly applicable by all rules of syntax to the Verb which followeth it: then is it of necessity to be received as the subject of this Proposition, then is this to be embraced as infallible Scripture-truth, God hath purchased the Church with his own bloud. But this God may and must be understood of Christ: it may, because he hath; it must, because no other person which is called God hath so purchased the Church. *We were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, but with the precious blood of Christ.* With this price were we bought; and therefore it may well be said, that Christ our God hath purchased us with his own bloud. But no other person which is, or is called, God, can be said so to have purchased us, because it is an act belonging properly to the Mediatourship; and *there is but one Mediatour between God and men*: and the Church is *sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all*. Nor can the expression of this act, peculiar to the Son, be attributed to the Father, because this bloud signifieth death; and though the Father be omnipotent, and can doe all things, yet he cannot die. And though it might be said that he purchased us, because he gave his Son to be a rancome for us, yet it cannot be said that he did it *by his own bloud*; for then it would follow, that he gave not his Son, or that the Son and the Father were the same Person. Beside, it is very observable, that this particular phrase of *his own bloud* is in the Scripture put by way of opposition to the bloud of † another: and howsoever we may attribute the acts of the Son unto the Father, because sent by him; yet we cannot but acknowledge that the bloud and death was of another then the Father. *Not by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place*: and whereas *the High-priest entered every year with the blood of others, Christ appeared once to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself*. He then which purchased us wrought it by his own bloud, as an High-priest opposed to the Aaronical, who made atonement by the bloud of others. But the Father taketh no Priestly office, neither could he be opposed to the legal Priest, as not dying himself, but giving another. Wherefore wheresoever the Father and the Son are described together as working the Salvation of man, the bloud by which it is wrought is attributed to the Son, not to the Father: as when S. Paul speaketh of the *redemption that is in Jesus Christ, whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness*; *his*, that is, *his own righteousness*, hath reference to God the Father; but *his*, that is, *his own blood*, must be referred to Christ the Son. When he glorifieth the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, attributing unto him, that he hath blessed, elected, predestinated, adopted, accepted us, made known unto us the myserie of his will, and gathered us together in one; in the midst of this acknowledgment he brings in *the beloved in whom we have redemption through his blood*, as that which cannot be attri-

* Τὸ ἐκκλησίαν τὴν Θεοῦ. For though the Church be properly the Church of Christ, Matt. 16. 18. Col. 1. 24. and in the plural we read once αἱ ἐκκλησίαι τῶν Χριστῶν, Rom. 16. 16. as we do of the Churches of God, 1 Cor. 11. 16. 2 Thess. 1. 4. and 1 Thess. 2. 14. yet ἡ ἐκκλησία τῶν Θεῶν is frequently used; as 1 Cor. 1. 2. and 10. 32. and 15. 9. and 11. 22. 2 Cor. 1. 1. 1 Tim. 3. 5. 15. but ἡ ἐκκλησία τῶν Χριστῶν not once named. And therefore we have no reason to alter it in this Text, or to phrase it first written Χρῆς, and then made Θεῶν, when it is so often writtē Θεῶν, not Χριστῶν. Some MSS. as the Alexandrian, Cantabrigian, and New Coll. MSS. read it τῶν Χριστῶν, and the Interpreter of Irenaeus regere Ecclesiam Domini, l. 3. c. 14. Others represent Κυ-

εῖς τὸ Θεῶν, followed by the Arabic Interpreter; which makes not at all against our argument; but, because in this particular unusual, not like to be true. The Syriack translating it Christi, (ܡܨܡܐܝܬ, not Domino, as it is in the Latine Translation) gives rather an exposition then a version. * 1 Pet. 1. 18, 19. † Heb. 10. 10. ‡ Ἰδιὸν αἷμα is opposed to αἷμα ἀλλόθεν. And therefore it is observable that the Author of the Racovian Catechism, in his Answer to this place of Scripture, doth never make the least mention of ἰδιὸν or proprium, but only affirms that the bloud of Christ may be called the bloud of God the Father; & totidem verbis did Socinus answer to Nickus before, but in his whole answer concealed the force of ἰδιὸν: whereas the strength of our Argument lies in those words, διὰ τοῦ ἰδιου αἵματος, or, as the Alexandrian MS. and one mentioned by Beza, διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ ἰδιου, ἢ διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ Θεοῦ. * Heb. 9. 12. † Vers. 25, 26. ‡ Rom. 3. 25. * Οὐ μετέτετο ὁ Θεὸς ἰσχυροῦς διὰ τὸ πιστεῖν ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι, ὡς ἐν ἰσχυρῶν τῶν ἀγαθῶν αὐτοῦ. † Eph. 1. 6, 7.

Act. 3. 26. *Christ* hath blessed us; and the Apostle saith, the Father hath blessed us: which is true, because *he sent his Son to bless us*. *Christ* hath made known unto us the will of his Father; and the Apostle saith, the Father *hath made known unto us the mysterie of his will*; because he sent his Son to reveal it. *Christ* hath delivered us; and the Father is said to *deliver us from the power of darknes*: not that we are twice delivered, but because the Father delivereth us by his Son. And thus these general Acts are familiarly attributed to them both; but still a difference must be observed and acknowledged in the means or manner of the performance of these Acts. For though 'tis true that the Father and the Son revealed to us the will of God; yet it is not true that the Father revealed it by himself to us; but that the Son did so, it is. They both deliver us from sin and death: but the Son *gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us*; the Father is not, cannot be, said to have given himself, but his Son: and therefore the Apostle giveth thanks unto the Father, *who hath delivered us from the power of darknes, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son, in whom we have redemption through his blood*. Now this blood is not onely the blood of the new Covenant, and consequently of the Mediatour: but the nature of this Covenant is such, that it is also a Testament, and therefore the blood must be the blood of the Testatour; for where a Testament is, there must also of necessity be the death of the Testatour. But the Testatour which died is not, cannot be, the Father, but the Son; and consequently, the blood is the blood of the Son, not of the Father. It remaineth therefore that God, who purchased the Church with his own blood, is not the Father of our Lord *Jesus Christ*, or any other which is called God, but onely *Jesus Christ* the Son of God, and God. And thus have I proved the first of the three Assertions, that the name of *God* absolutely taken and placed subjectively is sometimes to be understood of *Christ*.

The second, That the name of *God* invested by way of excellency with an Article is attributed in the Scriptures unto *Christ*, may be thus made good. He which is called *Emmanuel* is named God by way of Excellency; for that name, saith S. *Matthew*, being interpreted, is *God with us*, and in that interpretation the Greek † Article is prefixed. But *Christ* is called *Emmanuel*; ^a that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the Prophet, saying, Behold, a Virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name *Emmanuel*. Therefore he is that *God with us*, which is expressed by way of excellency, and distinguished from all other who are any way honoured with that name. For it is a vain imagination to think that *Christ* is called *Emmanuel*, but that he is not what he is called: as *Moses* built an Altar, and called the name of it *Jehovah Nissi*, and *Gideon* another called *Jehovah Shalom*; and yet neither Altar was *Jehovah*: as *Jerusalem* was called the Lord our righteousness, and yet that City was not the Lord. Because these two notions, which are conjoynd in the name *Emmanuel*, are severally true of *Christ*. First, he is *Emmanuel*, that is, *with us*, for he hath dwelt among us: and when he parted from the earth, he said to his Disciples, *I am with you alway, even to the end of the world*. Secondly, he is *El*, and that name was given him, as the same Prophet testifieth, *For unto us a child is born, unto us a Son is given; and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellour, the mighty God*. He then who is both properly called *El*, that is, *God*, and is also really *Emmanuel*, that is, *with us*, he must infallibly be that *Emmanuel* who is *God with us*. Indeed if the name *Emmanuel* were to be interpreted by way of a proposition, *God is with us*, as the Lord our righteousness, and the Lord is there, must be understood where they are the names of *Jerusalem*; then should it have been the name not of *Christ*,

Matt. 1. 23.

† Καὶ ἡ ἀρχὴ
τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐ-
τοῦ Ἐμμαν-
ουὴλ, ὃ ἐστὶν,
μεθ' ἡμῶν ὁ
Θεὸς.

a Vers. 22. 23.

Exod. 17. 15.

Judges 6. 24.

Jer. 33. 16.

John 1. 14.

Matt. 28. 20.

Ezra 7. 12.

Isa. 9. 6.

Isa. 9. 6.

Isa. 9. 6.

Ezek. 48. 35.

Christ, but of his Church : and if we under the Gospel had been called so, it could have received no other interpretation in reference to us. But being it is not ours, but our Saviour's name, it bears no kind of similitude with those objected appellations, and is as properly and directly to be attributed to the *Messias* as the name of *Jesus*. Wherefore it remaineth that *Christ* be acknowledged God with us, according to the Evangelicall interpretation, with an expression of that excellency which belongeth to the supreme Deity.

Again, He to whom S. Thomas said, *My Lord and my God*, or rather, *The Lord of me and the God of me*, he is that God before whose name the Greek Article is prefixed, which they require, by way of excellency. But S. Thomas spake these words * to *Christ*. For *Jesus spake unto Thomas, and Thomas answered and said unto him, My Lord and my God*. And in these † words he made confession of his Faith; for our Saviour replied, *Thomas, because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed*. And let him be the Lord of me, and the God of me, who was the Lord and the God of an Apostle.

ther. So Theodorus Mopsuestinus in his Commentary on S. John; Thomas quidem, cum sic credidisset, Dominus meus & Deus meus dicit, non ipsum Dominum & Deum dicens, (non enim resurrectionis scientia docebat & Deum esse cum qui resurrexit) sed quasi miraculoso facto Deum collaudat. Syn. V. Collat. 4. As if Thomas had intended only to have praised God for raising *Christ*. But first, it is plain that Thomas answered *Christ*; secondly, that he spake unto him, that is, to *Christ*, and consequently that the words which he spake belong to *Christ*; thirdly, that the words are a Confession of his Faith in *Christ*, as our Saviour doth acknowledge. And whereas Franciscus Davidis did object, that in a Latine Testament he found, not & dixit ei, but & dixit *without* ei, it is sufficiently discomenanced by Socinus in his Epistle, affirming that all the Greek and Latine Copies had it, except that one which he had found: and therefore the omission must be imputed to the negligence of the Printer. † Ο Κύριός μου καὶ ὁ Θεός μου. Either in these words there is an Ellipsis of ἡ σὺ, Thou art my Lord, thou art my God; or an Antiptosis, the Nominative case used for the Vocative, as Ἐλπί, Ἐλπί, ὁ Θεός μου, ὁ Θεός μου, Mark 15. 34. Ἀκούε ὁ πατήρ, Mark 14. 36. and Χάρε ὁ βασιλεὺς ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς, John 19. 3. If it be an Ellipsis of the Verb εἶ, so frequent in the Scriptures, and of the Person sufficiently understood in the preceding Proposition; then is it evident that ὁ Θεός is attributed unto *Christ*, for then S. Thomas said unto him, Thou art ὁ Θεός μου. If it be an Antiptosis, though the construction require not a Verb, yet the signification virtually requirerth as much, which is equivalent: for he acknowledgeth him as much God while he calleth him so, as if he did affirm him to be so. Neither can it be objected that the Article ὁ serveth only in the place of &, as signifying that the Nominative is to be taken for the Vocative case; because the Nominative may as well stand vocatively without an Article, as Ἰωσήφ, υἱὸς Δαβὶδ, Matt. 1. 20. and Ἐλπίσον ἡμᾶς, Κύριε, υἱὸς Δαβὶδ, Matt. 20. 30, 31. and therefore when the Vocative is invested with an Article, it is as considerable as in a Nominative. And being these words were an expression of the Apostle's Faith, as *Christ* understood and approved them, they must contain in them, virtually at least, a Proposition; because no act of our Faith can be expressed, where the Object is not at least a virtual Proposition. And in that Proposition, ὁ Θεός must be the Predicate, and *Christ*, to whom these words are spoken, must also be the Subject. It cannot therefore be avoided, but that S. Thomas did attribute the name of God to our Saviour with an Article. Indeed to me there is no doubt but S. Thomas in these words did make, as true and real a confession of his Faith concerning the Person of *Christ*, as S. Peter did, when he answered and said, Thou art *Christ*, the Son of the living God, Matt. 16. 16. and consequently, that ὁ Κύριός μου and ὁ Θεός μου do as properly belong unto him, as S. Peter's ὁ Χριστός and υἱός. As therefore *Christ* said to his Disciples, Vos vocatis me ὁ Θεός μου, καὶ ὁ Κύριός μου, & bene dicitis, sum etenim, John 13. 13. so he might have replied to Thomas, You call me ὁ Κύριός μου and ὁ Θεός μου, and you say well, for I am so. As for the Objection of Socinus, that though *Deus* be here spoken of *Christ*, and that with an Article ὁ, yet that Article is of no force because of the following Proposition μου: it is most groundless: for the Article do cannot have relation to the following Proposition μου, ἐπὶ πᾶσι ἡ ἀπαρχὴ τοῦ ἀνθρωπίνου γένους ἐν Ἰουδαίᾳ πᾶσι τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἀφ' ὧν παρὰ τὸν Χριστὸν; as that great Critick Apollonius Alexandrinus observes, l. 1. de Syntaxi c. 30. And if for μου it were ὁ ἑμὸς, yet even that Article would belong to *Deus*, for in these words, ὁ Θεός ὁ ἑμὸς, neither Article belongs to ἑμὸς, but both to *Deus*, for, as the same Critick observes in the same case, τὰ δύο ἄρθρα εἰς μίαν τιὴν εὐθὺς ἀναφέρονται: ἕκαστον ἐν τῷ ὁ πατήρ ὁ ἑμὸς, καὶ ἡνῶν γὰρ τὸ ἔπρεον ἦν ἀφ' ὧν ἐπὶ τῷ ἀνθρωπίνῳ γένει. So that if ὁ Θεός be the supreme God, then ὁ Θεός μου must be my supreme God: as when David speaks to God, ὁ Θεός, ὁ Θεός μου, πρὸς σὺ ἐθελῶ, Psal. 62. 1. the latter is of as great importance as the former. So again Psal. 42. 5. ἐξομολογήσομαι ἐν κινήσει ὁ Θεός, ὁ Θεός μου and 49. 3. ὁ Θεός ἐμπαρὸς ἡμῶν, ὁ Θεός ἡμῶν and 70. 13. ὁ Θεός μου μακρῶς ἀπ' ἡμῶν, ὁ Θεός μου. I dare not therefore say to any person that he is ὁ Θεός μου, except I do believe that he is ὁ Θεός. Wherefore I conclude that the words of S. Thomas, ὁ κύριός μου καὶ ὁ Θεός μου, are as fully and highly significative as those of David, Πέτρος τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ὁ βασιλεὺς μου καὶ ὁ Θεός μου, Psal. 5. 2. or those, ὁ Θεός μου καὶ κύριός μου, εἰς τὸ ἰσχυρὸν μου, Psal. 35. 23. or those, τὰ δύσπασιν ἐλπίσιν, κύριε ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς, ὁ βασιλεὺς μου καὶ ὁ Θεός μου, Psal. 84. 3. or those of S. John in the Revelation, as they lie in the Alexandrian and Complutensian Copies, Ἀκούε εἰ, ὁ κύριός μου καὶ ὁ Θεός ἡμῶν ὁ ἀρχὸς, λαβὼν, &c. or that lastly in the most ancient Hymn, Κύριε ὁ Θεός, ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ... ἐλπίσον ἡμᾶς.

Nor have we onely their required testimony of *Christ*'s supreme Divinity, but also an addition of verity allerting that Supremacy. For he is not onely termed the God, but, for a farther certainty, *the true God*: and the same Apostle who said the Word was God, lest any cavil should arise by any omission of an Article, though so frequently neglected by all, even the most accurate Authours, hath also assured us that he is the true God. For, *we know*, saith he, *that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding that we may*

1 John 5. 20.

† Οὗτός ἐστιν
ὁ ἀληθινός
Θεός, ὃς ἡ
ζωὴ αἰώνιος.
Hic agitur
non solum de
vero Deo, sed
de illo uno
vero Deo,
ut articulus
in Græco ad-
ditus indicat.
Catech. Ræc.
* Act. 10. 36.
* Οὗτος for
θεός, as Act. 8.
26. Σὺ δὲ ἴσπε-
σαι ἡμᾶς
Γὰρ αὐτὸ αὐτῷ
ἐστὶν ἔρημος,
quæ est de-
serta.
b Act. 7. 18,
19.

know him that is true : and we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ. † This is the true God, and eternall life. As therefore we read in the Acts of the ^a Word which God sent unto the children of Israel, preaching peace by Jesus Christ ; he is Lord of all ; where it is acknowledged that the Lord of all is by the Pronoun * he joyned unto Jesus Christ, the immediate, not unto God, the remote antecedent : so likewise here the true God is to be referred unto Christ, who stands next unto it, not unto the Father, spoken of indeed in the Text, but at a distance. There is no reason alledged why these last words should not be referred to the Son of God, but onely this, that in Grammatical construction they may be ascribed to the Father. As, when ^b another King arose which knew not Joseph, the same dealt subtilly with our kindred ; the same referreth us not to Joseph, but to the King of Egypt. Whereas, if nothing else can be objected but a possibility in respect of the Grammatical construction, we may as well say that Joseph dealt subtilly with his kindred as the King of Egypt ; for whatsoever the incongruity be in History, it makes no solœcism in the Syntax. Wherefore being Jesus Christ is the immediate Antecedent to which the Relative may properly be referred ; being the Son of God is he of whom the Apostle chiefly speaketh ; being this is rendred as a reason why we are in him that is true, by being in his Son, to wit, because that Son is the true God ; being in the language of S. John the constant title of our Saviour is eternall life ; being all these reasons may be drawn out of the Text it self, why the title of the true God should be attributed to the Son, and no one reason can be raised from thence why it should be referred to the Father : I can conclude no less, then that our Saviour is the true God, so styled in the Scriptures by way of eminency, with an Article prefixed, as the * first Christian writers which immediately followed the Apostles did both speak and write.

* Δὲ ὁ
Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς
τὸν Θεόν.
Ignat. Epist.
ad Smyrn.

* Εὐ δὲ ἀληθινὸν τὸ Παῖδες, ὃς Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς τὸν Θεόν ἡμῶν. Id. Ep. ad Eph. 'Ο ὃς Θεός ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστὸς ἐνομοποιήθη κατὰ Μακρίαν. ib. 'Ο ὃς Θεός ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ἐν Πατρὶ ὁ μὲν δὲν παῖς ἐστίν. Ep. ad Rom. Τὸ δὲ δὲ λόγος τὰ λόγια πλάσμα ἡμῶν. Cl. Alex. adv. Gent. And it was well observed by the Author of the Μικρὰ Λαλῶντες, written about the beginning of the third Century, that not onely the ancient Fathers before him, as Justine, Miltiades, Tatianus, Clements, Irenæus, Melito, &c. did speak of Christ as God, but that the Hymns also penned by Christians from the beginning did express Christ's Divinity. Ψαυοὶ ὃς Θεός ὃς Θεός ἀδελφῶν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς καὶ πρὸν γεγενῆσθαι τὸν λόγον τὸν Θεόν τὸν Χριστὸν ὑμῶν Θεογονῶντες. And the Epistle of Ptolemy Trajan testifies the same, Quod essent soliti statò die ante lucem convenire, carmenque Christo quasi Deo dicere.

Rom. 9. 5.

† Though some
would have
God out of
the Text, upon
this pretense,
because S. Cy-
prius, in

lib. 2. adv. Judeos, citing this place, leaves it out. But that must needs be by the negligence of some of the Scribes, as is evident. First, because Mannius and Morellius found the word Deus in their Copies, and both the MSs. which Pamelius used acknowledge it. Secondly, because S. Cyr. produceth the Text to prove quod Deus Christus ; and reckoneth it among the rest in which he is called expressly God. Thirdly, because Tertullian, whose disciple S. Cypr. professed himself, did both so read it and so use it. Solum autem Christum potero Deum dicere, sicut idem Apostolus, Ex quibus Christus, qui est (inquit) Deus super omnia benedictus in ævum omne. Adv. Praxeam. And again in the same Book ; Hunc & Paulus conspexit, nec tamen Patrem vidit. Nonne, inquit, vidi Jesum ? Christum autem & ipsum Deum cognominavit : Quorum Patres, & ex quibus Christus secundum carnem, qui est per (vel super) omnia Deus benedictus in ævum. Novatianus de Trinitate nescit the same Argument. And another ancient Author very expressly ; Rogo te, Deum credis esse Filium, an non ? Sine dubio, responsurus es, Deum ; quia, etsi negare volueris, sanctis Scripturis convinceris, dicente Apostolo, Ex quibus Christus secundum carnem, qui est super omnia Deus benedictus in secula. So also S. Aug. Non solum Pater Deus est, sicut etiam omnes Hæretici concedunt, sed etiam Filius ; quod, velint nolint, coguntur fateri, dicente Apostolo, Qui est super omnia Deus benedictus in secula. De Trin. l. 2. c. 13. & contra Faustum

Fanſtum l. 16. c. 15. As for the Objection, that S. Chryſoſtome doth not ſignifie in his Commentaries that he read *θεός* in the Text: I answer that neither does he ſignifie that he read *ὁ ἐν παντί*, for in his expoſition he paſſeth over wholly *ὁ ἐν παντί* *θεός*: but it doth not follow that he read not *ὁ ἐν παντί* in the Text. But when he repeats the words of the Apoſtle, he agrees wholly with the Greek Text, *ὁ ὢν ἐν παντί* *θεός* *εὐλογητός*: And Theodorēt, who lived not long after him, doth not onely acknowledge the words, but give a full Expoſition of them: *Ἡμεῖς μὲν ἢ τοῦ χρίστος, ἀποδοῦναι πνευματικῶς τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ τοῦ θεοῦ τὸ θεῖον αἶμα· ἀλλ' ὁ περ ἐν τῷ πνεύματι ἐμμενός, τὸ θεῖον αἶμα ἐν αἰσθητοῖς· Δαδὶ δὲ χρίστος, ἐπιμαρτυρεῖ, τὸ θεῖον αἶμα· ὡς δὲ ἐν δυνάμει· ἵπτος ἐν ταῦτα εἰπὼν τὸ, χρίστος, ἀποδοῦναι τὸ, ὢν ἐν παντί* *θεός* *εὐλογητός* *εἰς τοῦ αἰῶνα*. As for the omiſſion of *Deus* in S. Hilary on the Pſalms, it muſt of neceſſity be attributed to the negligence of the Scribe, not to the reading of the Father. For how he read it he hath clearly expreſſed in his books De Trinitate: Non ignorat Paulus Chriſtum Deum, dicens, Quorum ſunt Patres, & ex quibus Chriſtus, qui eſt ſuper omnia Deus. Non hic creatura in Deum deputatur, ſed creaturarum Deus eſt, qui ſuper omnia Deus eſt. The pious therefore of Eraſmus from the Fathers is vain; and as vain is that of Grotius from the Syriac Tranſlation, which hath in it the name of God expreſſly, as well as all the Copies of the Original, and all the reſt of the Tranſlations, כִּי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ יְהוָה * *Τὸ χρίστος* oppoſed unto *τὸ χρίστος* as Rom. 1. 3. where *χρίστος* is uſed without an Article, becauſe *χρίστος*, to which it is oppoſed, followeth, and ſo the oppoſition is of it ſelf apparent. But here being *χρίστος* is not to be expreſſed in the following words, the Article *τὸ* ſignifying of it ſelf a diſtinction or exception, ſheweth that it is to be underſtood. † *Ὁ ὢν ἐν παντί*. Not in omnibus, as Eraſmus, nor ſuper omnes, as Beza, with reference to the Fathers, which ſhould have been *ἐν παντί* *αὐτῶν*: but, as the Vulgar Tranſlation, and the ancient Fathers before that, ſuper omnia, *ἐν* for *ἐν παντί*, as John 3. 31. *ὁ ἀνωθεν ἐρχόμενος ἐπὶ πάντας* *πάντας* *ἐστίν*, which ſignifies no leſs than *יְהוָה*, the ordinary name of God, *ὁ ὕψις*, the moſt high; as it is taken for the ſupreme God by it ſelf, Acts 7. 48. and is deſcribed, Pſal. 97. 9. *Ὁν οὐ εἷς, Κύριος, ὁ ὕψις ἐν παντί* *τῶν γνῶν*, *Κεδομένη* *ὑποψώμενος* *ὑποψώμενος* *τοῦ θεοῦ*.

elsewhere ſignifieth the * ſupreme God; and was always uſed by the Jews to expreſs that one God of *Israel*. Wherefore it cannot be conceived S. Paul ſhould write unto the Chriſtians, moſt of which then were converted Jews or Proſelytes, and give unto our Saviour not onely the name of God, but alſo adde that title which they always gave unto the one God of *Israel*, and to none but him; except he did intend they ſhould believe him to be the ſame God whom they always in that manner and under that notion had adored. As therefore the Apoſtle ſpeaketh of *the God and Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, which is bleſſed for evermore*, of the Creatour, *who is bleſſed for ever, Amen*; and thereby doth ſignifie the ſupreme Deity, which was ſo glorified by the *Israelites*; and doth alſo teſtifie that we worship the ſame God under the Goſpel which they did under the Law: ſo doth he ſpeak of *Chriſt* in as ſublime a ſtile, *who is over all, God bleſſed for ever, Amen*; and thereby doth teſtifie the equality, or rather identity, of his Deity. If we conſider the ſcope of the Apoſtle, which is to magnifie the *Israelites* by the enumeration of ſuch privileges as belonged peculiarly to that choſen Nation, (the moſt eminent of which was contained in the Genealogy of our Saviour) we ſhall find their glory did not conſiſt in this, that *Chriſt* at firſt was born of them a man, and afterwards made a God; for what great honour could accrue to them by the nativity of a man, whoſe Godhead is referred not to his birth, but to his death? whereas this is truly honourable, and the peculiar glory of that Nation, that the moſt High God bleſſed for ever ſhould take on him the ſeed of Abraham, and come out of the *Israelites* as concerning the fleſh. Thus every-way it doth appear, the Apoſtle ſpoke of *Chriſt* as of the one eternall God.

* As Mar. 14. 61. *Σὺ εἶ ὁ Χεῖρας, ὁ ὕψις τὸ εὐλογητός*. Art thou the Chriſt, the Son of the Bleſſed; where the vulgar attribution is taken for God himſelf, which is uſually adde to the name of God; as 2 Cor. 11. 21. *Ὁ θεός, ὁ ὢν εὐλογητός εἰς τοῦ αἰῶνα*, or to any deſcription of him; as, *ἐλάττω δὲ τῶν ἁγίων πνεύματι τῶν ἀποστόλων*, *ὡς ὁ κύριος εὐλογητός εἰς τοῦ αἰῶνα*, *Ἀμήν*. And theſe expreſſions of S. Paul are conſonant to the ancient cuſtome of the

Jews, who, when the Prieſt in the Sanctuary rehearſed the Name of God, were wont to answer, Bleſſed be his name for ever. Inſomuch as the Bleſſed one did ſignifie in their language as much as the Holy one, and both, or either of them, the God of *Israel*. Hence are ſo frequent in the Rabbins, *הַקדוֹשׁ בְּרוּךְ הוּא*, the holy bleſſed one, and *הַנּוֹרָא בְּרוּךְ הוּא*, the Bleſſed one, that they are written by abbreviation, *הקב"ה* or *הב"ה*, add the infinite bleſſed one, *א"ס ב"ה*, Bleſſed be God for ever, Amen, and Amen, *ב"ה*, and *א"ס*. * 2 Cor. 11. 31. Rom. 1. 25.

He then who was the Word which in the beginning was with God, and was God; he whoſe glory *Iſaias* ſaw as the glory of the God of *Israel*; he who is ſtyled Alpha and Omega without any reſtriction or limitation; he who was truly ſubſiſting in the form of God, and equal with him, before he was in the nature of man; he who being man is frequently called God, and that in all thoſe ways by which the ſupreme Deity is expreſſed; He had a being before *Chriſt* was conceived by the Virgin *Mary*, and the being which he had was the one eternall and indiviſible Divine eſſence, by which he always was truly,

known ledge him *ὁμοούσιον*, which the Arians endeavoured to make *σὸν* *οὐσίον*; and therefore the Council in opposition to them determined it, Quid est aliud cur Homousion Patri nolint Filium dici, nisi quia nolunt verum Dei Filium? sicut Author ipsorum Eusebii Nicomedienfis Epistola fua prodidit, dicens, Si verum, inquit, Dei Filium & increatum dicimus, Homousion cum Patre incipimus confiteri. Hæc cum læta esset Epistola in Concilio Niceno, hoc verbum in Tractatu fidei poluerunt Patres, quod id videretur adversarius esse formidini, ut tanquam evaginato ab ipsis gladio ipsorum nefandæ caput hæresis amputarent. S. *Apolof.* l. 3. de Fide, c. 7. De voce *ὁμοούσιον* vide Dionys. Petar. de Trinit. l. 4. c. 6. ^a John 10. 30. ^b Ἀδελφῶν ὃν τὸν θεὸν εἶπεν ἔφημ' ἔφημ' ὁ κυριώτης νομινοῦσθαι. Damas. l. 1. c. 8. ^c Εἰ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ; ὃν αὐτὸν ἢ θεὸς εἶπα, ἀλλ' ἔφημ' ὃν, καὶ αὐτὸν, ὡς θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ, ὃς πατὴρ ἢ ἑσθὲ; πῶς ἀμμερικυλὶ ἐνέστηεν αὐτὸν ἔχειν λέγοντες ἐκ εὐχοντα; S. *Atthas.* Græc. 2.

The fourth Assertion followeth, That the Communication of the Divine essence by the Father is the generation of the Son; and *Christ*, who was eternally God, not from himself, but from the Father, is the eternall Son of God. That God always had a Son, appeareth by *Agur's* question in the Proverbs of *Solomon*; *Who hath established all the ends of the earth? what is his name? and what is his Son's name? if thou canst tell.* And it was the chief design of *Mahomet* to deny this truth, because he knew it was not otherwise possible to prefer himself before our Saviour. One Prophet may be greater then another, and *Mahomet* might persuade his credulous disciples that he was greater then any of the sons of men; but while any one was believed to be the eternall Son of God, he knew it wholly impossible to prefer himself before him.

Wherefore he frequently inculcates that blasphemy in his * Alcoran, that God hath no such Son, nor any equal with him : and his disciples have † corrupted the Psalm of David, reading, (in stead of *Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee,*) *Thou art my Prophet, I have educated thee.* The later † Jews, acknowledging the words, and the proper literal reading of them, apply them so unto David, as that they deny them to belong to Christ; and that upon no other ground, then that by such an exposition they may avoid the Christians Confession. But by the consent of the ancient Jews, by the interpretation of the blessed Apostles, we know these words belong to Christ, and in the most proper sense to him alone. † For, unto which of the Angels said he at any time, *Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee?* as the Apostle argues. And if he had spoken them unto any other man, as they were spoken unto him, the Apostle's Argument had been none at all.

mention this as the first principle of Mahumetanism," *Οπ' εἰς θεός ἐστι, παντὶς ἡμῶν ἕλων, μὴτε Ἰουδαίῃς, μὴτε Ἰουδαῖς. And Joannes Siculus and Georgius Cedrenus relate how Mahomet gave command, "Ενα μόνον σεσχωκωμεν θεόν, καὶ τὸν Χριστὸν προῖον εἰς λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ μὴδ, καὶ υἱὸν αὐτοῦ. And we read of his ridiculous History, that Christ, after his ascension into Heaven, was accused by God for calling him self his Son; and that he denied it, as being so named once by men without any authority from him. "Οπ' ἀνέβησεν τὸν Χριστὸν εἰς τὴν ἑσπέρην ἡρώπτην τοῦ θεοῦ, λέγων, Ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ὁ υἱὸς πᾶν λόγον ἔσται. "Οπ' ὑβος αἰμὴ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ θεός. καὶ ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Οπ' ἐκ ἐπὶ τῶν ἑρῶν, ὅδε αἰχμαλωτῆς ἐστὶν ἑλῶς σὺ ἀλλ' οἱ ἄνθρωποι λέγουσιν ὅτι ἦσαν τὸν λόγον ἔσται. † *Alpharabius in his Kamus: Dictionum Dei omnipotentis ad Jesum, (cui propitius sit & pacem concedat Deus) Tu es Nabija, Propheta meus, ego walladetea, fovi te; at dixitur Christiani, Tu es Bonaya, filius meus, ego walladetea, te genui. Longe est supra hæc Deus. And to the same purpose Ebnol Atbir: In Evangelio dixit Ise, Ego walladetea, i. e. educavi te; at Christiani, dempta litera Lam altera, ipsum esse filium staverunt. Qui longe elatus est super ea quæ dicunt. Whereas then the Apostles attributed those words of the Psalm to Christ, the Mahumetans, who could not deny but they were spoken of the Messias, were forced to corrupt the Text: and for that they pretend the eminency and excellency of the Godhead, as if it were beneath the Majesty of God to beget a Son, or be a Father. And indeed whosoever would bring in another Prophet greater then Christ, as he was then Moses, must do so. ¶ I say, the later Jews so attribute those words to David, as if they belonged not to the Messias; but the ancient Jews understood them of the Christ: as appeareth not only out of those places in the Evangelists where the Christ and the Son of God are synonymous; but also by the testimony of the later Jews themselves, who have confessed no less. So Rabbi David Kimchi in the end of his Commentaries on the second Psalm, ויש מפרשים זה המומר על גוג ומגנו והמשיח הוא מלך המשיח וכן פירש רבותינו דר' גוג ומגו, and the anointed is Messias the King; and so our Doctors of happy memory have expounded it. And Rabbi Solomon Jarchi not only confesseth that the ancient Rabbins did interpret it of the Messias, but shews the reason why the later Jews understood it rather of David, that thereby they might the better answer the Argument of the Christians deduced from thence: רבותינו דרשו את הענין על מלך המשיח ולפי משמעות התשובת המנים נכון לפתור על דוד עצמו. Our Doctors have expounded it of the Messias: but as to the literal sense, and for the answering Hereticks, (that is, in their language, Christians) it is rather to be interpreted of David in his own person. * Heb. i. 5.**

Now that the Communication of the Divine essence by the Father (which we have already proved) was the true and proper generation by which he hath begotten the Son, will thus appear : because the most proper generation which we know is nothing else but a vital production of another in the same nature.

nature, with a full representation of him from whom he is produced. Thus Man begetteth a son, that is, produceth another man of the same humane nature with himself; and this production, as a perfect generation, becomes the foundation of the relation of Paternity in him that produceth, and of Filiation in him that is produced. Thus after the prolificall benediction, *Be fruitfull and multiply, Adam begat in his own likeness, after his image*: and by the continuation of the same blessing, the succession of humane generations hath been continued. This then is the known * confession of all men, that a Son is nothing but another produced by his Father in the same nature with him. But God the Father hath communicated to the Word the same Divine essence by which he is God; and consequently he is of the same nature with him, and thereby the perfect image and similitude of him, and therefore his proper Son. In humane generations we may conceive two kinds of similitude; one in respect of the internall nature, the other in reference to the externall form or figure. The former similitude is essential and necessary; it being impossible a man should beget a son, and that son not be by nature a man: the latter accidental; not onely sometimes the child representing this, sometimes the other parent, but also oftentimes neither. † The similitude then in which the propriety of generation is preserved is that which consisteth in the identity of nature: and this Communication of the Divine essence by the Father to the Word is evidently a sufficient foundation of such a similitude; from whence *Christ* is called *the image of God, the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person*.

Gen. 1. 23. And 5. 3.

* Κοινὸν ὑπερ-
ἀρχεν πατέρα καὶ
υἱὸς ἰσὺς
κλόνος καὶ ἰσὺς
γυναικα, αἱ αὖ-
παρ ὧς τὸ αὐ-
τὸς ἐστὶν τὸ
καὶ ὑποκρίσας
ἐστὶν καὶ φύ-
σιν. Phot.
Epist. 1. This is
in the language
of Aristotle,
τὸ παῖσι καὶ ἐ-
τερον οἱ αὐ-
τοῦ ζῶον καὶ
ζῶον, οὐτὸν δὲ
οὐτὸν. And
S. Basil. l. 2.
contra Euno-
mum; πατὴρ
καὶ υἱὸς ὅτι
ὁ αὐτὸς ἐστὶν τὸ
καὶ ὑποκρίσας

καὶ ὁμοίαν ἑαυτοῦ φύσιν ἔχει καὶ παρὰ τὸν
dissimilis patri; tamen quia ejusdem substantiæ est,
non potest. S. Aug. contra Maximin. c. 13.

† Etiam si filius hominis, homo, in quibusdam similis, in quibusdam sit
negari verus filius non potest; & quia verus est filius, negari ejusdem substan-
2. Cor. 4. 4. Heb. 1. 3.

Nor is this Communication of the Divine essence onely the proper generation of the Son, but we must acknowledge it far more proper then any natural generation of the Creature, not onely because it is in a more perfect manner, but also because the identity of nature is most perfect. As in the Divine essence we acknowledge all the perfections of the creature, subtracting all the imperfections which adhere unto them here in things below: so in the Communication we must look upon the reality without any kind of defect, blemish, or impurity. In humane generation the son is begotten in the same nature with the father, which is performed by derivation, or decision of part of the substance of the parent: but this decision includeth imperfection, because it supposeth a substance divisible, and consequently corporeal; whereas the essence of God is incorporeal, spiritual and indivisible; and therefore his nature is really communicated, not by derivation or decision, but by a total and plenary communication. In natural conceptions the father necessarily precedeth the son, and begetteth one younger then himself: for being Generation is for the perpetuity of the Species, where the Individuals successively fail, it is sufficient if the parent can produce another to live after him, and continue the existence of his nature, when his person is dissolved. But this presupposeth the imperfection of mortality, wholly to be removed when we speak of him who inhabiteth eternity: the essence which God always had without beginning, without beginning he did communicate; being always Father, as always God. * Animals, when they come to the perfection of nature, then become prolificall; in God eternall perfection sheweth his eternall fecundity. And that which is most remarkable,

* Πάντα ὅσα ἦσαν τέ-
λεια ἦσαν καὶ
τὸ αὐτὸ τέλειον
αἰεὶ καὶ αἰδίων
ἦσαν. Euseb.

de Prep. Evang. ex Plotino. Ἀνθρώπων μὲν οὐκ ἴδιον τὸ ἐν χρόνῳ ἡγεῖσθαι, διὰ τὸ ἀτελές τὸ φύσει· θεῶν δὲ αἰδίων τὸ γέννημα, διὰ
τὸ αἰεὶ τέλειον τὸ φύσει. S. Athan. Orat. 2. This was it which so much troubled the Arians, when they heard the Catholics constantly
asserting, αἰεὶ θεός, αἰεὶ υἱός· ἅμα πατήρ, ἅμα υἱός.

T

In

In humane generations the Son is of the same nature with the Father, and yet is not the same man; because though he hath an essence of the same kind, yet he hath not the same essence: the power of generation depending on the first prolificall benediction, *Increase and multiply*, it must be made by way of multiplication; and thus every Son becomes another man. But the Divine essence, being by reason of its simplicity not subject to division, and in respect of its infinity incapable of multiplication, is so communicated as not to be multiplied; insomuch that he which proceedeth by that communication hath not onely the same nature, but is also the same God. The Father God, and the Word God; *Abraham* man, and *Isaac* man: but *Abraham* one man, *Isaac* another man; not so the Father one God, and the Word another, but the Father and the Word both the same God. Being then the propriety of generation is founded in the essential similitude of the son unto the father, by reason of the same which he receiveth from him; being the full perfect nature of God is communicated unto the Word, and that more intimately and with a greater unity or identity then can be found in humane generations: it followeth that this Communication of the Divine nature is the proper generation by which *Christ* is, and is called, the true and proper Son of God. This was the foundation of *S. Peter's* Confession, *Thou art the Son of the living God*; this the ground of our Saviour's † distinction, *I go unto my Father, and to your Father*. Hence did *S. John* raise a verity, more then onely a negation of falsity, when he said, *we are in the true Son*: for we which are in him are true, not false, sons, we are not as *the true Son*. Hence did *S. Paul* draw an argument of the infinite love of God toward man, in that he *spared not his own proper son*. Thus have we sufficiently shewed, that the eternall communication of the Divine essence by the Father to the Word was a proper generation by which *Christ Jesus* always was the true and proper Son of God: which was our fourth Assertion.

† Multum distat inter dominationem & conditionem, inter generationem & adoptionem, inter substantiam & gratiam. Ideoque hic non permixte nec passim dicitur, *Ascendo ad Patrem nostrum* aut *Deum nostrum*; sed *ad Patrem meum & Patrem vestrum*, *ad Deum meum & ad Deum vestrum*. Aliter enim illi Deus Pater est, aliter nobis. Illum siquidem natura coequat, misericordia humiliat: nos vero natura prostermit, misericordia erigit. *Capitulus Carthag. Epist.*

* This was the fallacy which Eunomius endeavoured to put upon the Church, as appears by those words of his delivered

and answered by *S. Basil*; *Διὰ τὸ τοιοῦτον, φησὶ, μονογενὴς, ἰσχυρῶς παρὰ μόνον τῷ τῷ ἀβελήνῃ δυνάμει ἡμετέροις καὶ κληθεὶς πατρὸς καὶ υἱοῦ καὶ ἀδελφοῦ*. as if *μονογενὴς* were onely *παρὰ μόνον*, and unigenitus were nothing else but *genitus ab uno*. This *S. Basil* refuteth copiously: First, from the language of the Scriptures and the usage of mankind; *διὰ τὴν πατρὶαν καὶ τοῦ ὀνόματος τῷ μονογενὴς ἐκ αὐτοῦ γεννητός, παρὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν ἀνθρώπων συνήθειαν, καὶ παρὰ τὴν εὐσεβὴν καὶ γενητὴν πατρὸς καὶ υἱοῦ καὶ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ τὴν ἀνάγκην*. *Μονογενὴς γὰρ ὁ παρὰ μόνον ἡμετέρος, ἀλλ' ὁ μόνος ἡμετέρος, ὡς τῇ κοινῇ χρῆσιν ὁμοσυνήθισται*. Secondly, by a retort peculiar to that Heresy, which held the Son of God might be called *κληθεὶς* as well as *γεννηθεὶς*, created as well as begotten, and consequently might be as properly named *μονόκτιστος* as *μονογενὴς*. *Εἰ μὴ παρὰ τὸ μόνον γεγεννητός, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸ παρὰ μόνον μονογενὴς ὀνομάσκειται, τὸ αὐτὸ δὲ δὲ κατὰ οὐ τὸ αὐτὸς τῷ γεγεννητός, ἢ ὅτι καὶ Μονόκτιστος αὐτὸν ὀνομάζει*; Thirdly, by a particular instance shewing the absurdity of such an interpretation, for that thereby no man could properly be called *μονογενὴς*, because not begotten of one, but two parts. *Μονογενὴς δ' ὡς ὅτι, ἀνθρώπων ἑκείνους κατὰ γὰρ τὸν ὁμοῦτον λόγον, διὰ τὸ ἐκ συνδυασμοῦ πάντων ὑπερβαίνει τὴν ἡμετέραν*. ἡ δὲ ἡ Σάρρα μήτηρ μονογενὴς καὶ πατρὸς, διότι καὶ μὴ μόνον αὐτὴν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸν Ἀβελάμ, ἐπικυράσκει.

† The Socinians

Socinians make very much of this Notion, and apply it so unto Christ, as that thereby they might avoid all necessity of an eternall generation. So the Racovian Catechism: Causa cur Christo ista attributa (sc. proprium & unigenitum Dei Filium esse) competant, hæc est; quod inter omnes Dei filios & præcipuus sit, & Deo charissimus: quemadmodum Isaac, quia Abrahamo charissimus & hæres exstitit, unigenitus vocatus est, Heb. 11. 17. licet fratrem Ismaelem habuerit; & Solomon unigenitus coram matre sua, licet plures ex eadem matre fratres fuerint, 1 Paral. 3. 1, 2, 3, &c. And that this might be applied to the interpretation of the Creed, Seldingius hath inserted it as a material observation; Nam hic unicus seu unigenita filius nominatur, qui ceteris longe charior est Patri, longeq; præstantior; and confirms the Interpretation with those two testimonies concerning Isaac and Solomon. But certainly this Observation of theirs is vain, or what else they say is false. For if Christ be called the Son of God, because conceived by the Holy Ghost, and none else was ever so conceived, then is he the only-begotten by virtue of his generation. And if so, then is he not the Only-begotten as Isaac and Solomon were, that is, by the affection and prelation of their Parents. Or if Christ were the Only-begotten as Isaac and Solomon were, then was he not conceived after a singular manner, for the brethren of Solomon no way differed from him in their generation. It is plain therefore that this Interpretation was invented that, when all the rest should fail, they might stick to this.

ticks, who take the *Only-begotten* to be nothing else but the most beloved of all the sons; because Isaac was called the *only son* of Abraham, when we know that he had Ishmael beside, and Solomon said to be the *only-begotten before his Mother*, when David had other children even by the Mother of Solomon. For the *only-begotten* and the *most beloved* are not the same; the one having the nature of a cause in respect of the other, and the same cannot be cause and effect to it self. For though it be true, that the *only son* is the beloved son; yet with this order, that he is therefore beloved because the *only*, not therefore the *only* because beloved. Although therefore Christ be the *Only-begotten* and the beloved Son of God, yet we must not look upon these two Attributes as synonymous, or equally significant of the same thing, but as one depending on the other, Unigeniture being the foundation of his singular love. Beside, Isaac was called the *only Son* of Abraham for some other reason then because he was singularly beloved of Abraham; for he was the *only Son* of the free woman, the *only Son* of the promise made to Abraham, which was first this, *Sarah shall have a Son*, and then, *In Isaac shall thy seed* Gen. 18. 14. *be called*. So that Isaac may well be called the *only Son* of Abraham in reference to the promise, as the Apostle speaks expressly; *By faith Abraham* Heb. 11. 17. *when he was tried offered up Isaac, and he that had received the promises offered up his only-begotten Son*. Avoiding therefore these two expositions, as far short of the true notion of the *only-begotten*, we must look upon it in the most proper, full and significant sense, as signifying a Son so begotten as none other is, was, or can be: so as the term restrictive *only* shall have relation not only to the * Father generating, but also to the Son begotten, and to the manner of the generation. 'Tis true, the Father spake from Heaven, saying, *Thou art my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased*: and thereby we are to understand, that whosoever of us are beloved by the Father are so beloved in and through the Son. In the same manner Christ is the *Only-begotten* Son of God; and as many of us as God hath bestowed his love upon, that we should be called the sons of God, are all brought into that near relation by our fellowship with him, who is by a far more near relation the natural and eternall Son.

ὁτι μόνος, γενένηται. S. Cyrill adds these two *μόνος* and *μόνος* together, in relation to the Father and the Son: *Μονογενής* ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ πατρὸς ἀνθρώπων λόγος, ὅτι μόνος ἐκ μόνου γενένηται τῷ πατρί. Epist. 1. ad Regin. As Rufinus doth in Unicus: Ideo subjungit Unicum hunc esse Filium Dei, Unus enim de uno nascitur. Expos. Symb. S. Greg. Naz. adds to these two a third, in respect of the manner: *Μονογενής* ὅτι ὁ μόνος ἐκ μόνου, ἀλλ' ὅτι καὶ μονογενής, ὡς τὰ σώματα. So he somewhat obscurely and corruptly, but plainly enough in Damascene, who aims often to deliver himself in the words of Nazianzen: *Λέγεται μονογενής, ὅτι μόνος ἐκ μόνου τῷ πατρί μόνως ἐγενήθη: ὡς δὲ ὁμοῦται ἑτέρῳ γένει τῷ τῷ Θεῷ γενένηται, ὡς γὰρ ὁμοῦ ἀλλ' ὡς τῷ Θεῷ.*

Having thus declared the interpretation of the word, that, properly, as Primogeniture consisteth in Prelation, so Unigeniture in Exclusion; and that none can be strictly called the *Only-begotten* but he who alone was so begotten: we shall proceed to make good our Assertion, shewing that the Divine Essence was peculiarly communicated to the Word, by which he was begotten the Son of God, and never any was so begotten beside that Son.

T 2

And

In humane generations the Son is of the same nature with the Father, and yet is not the same man; because though he hath an essence of the same kind, yet he hath not the same essence: the power of generation depending on the first prolificall benediction, *Increase and multiply*, it must be made by way of multiplication; and thus every Son becomes another man. But the Divine essence, being by reason of its simplicity not subject to division, and in respect of its infinity incapable of multiplication, is so communicated as not to be multiplied; insomuch that he which proceedeth by that communication hath not onely the same nature, but is also the same God. The Father God, and the Word God; *Abraham* man, and *Isaac* man: but *Abraham* one man, *Isaac* another man; not so the Father one God, and the Word another, but the Father and the Word both the same God. Being then the propriety of generation is founded in the essential similitude of the son unto the father, by reason of the same which he receiveth from him; being the full perfect nature of God is communicated unto the Word, and that more intimately and with a greater unity or identity then can be found in humane generations: it followeth that this Communication of the Divine nature is the proper generation by which *Christ* is, and is called, the true and proper Son of God. This was the foundation of *S. Peter's* Confession, *Thou art the Son of the living God*; this the ground of our Saviour's † distinction, *I go unto my Father, and to your Father*. Hence did *S. John* raise a verity, more then onely a negation of falsity, when he said, *we are in the true Son*: for we which are in him are true, not false, sons, we are not as *the true Son*. Hence did *S. Paul* draw an argument of the infinite love of God toward man, in that he *spared not his own proper son*. Thus have we sufficiently shewed, that the eternall communication of the Divine essence by the Father to the Word was a proper generation by which *Christ Jesus* always was the true and proper Son of God: which was our fourth Assertion.

† Multum distat inter dominationem & conditionem, inter generationem & adoptionem, inter substantiam & gratiam. Ideoque hic non permixte nec passim dicitur, *Ascendo ad Patrem nostrum aut Deum nostrum*; sed *ad Patrem meum & Patrem vestrum, ad Deum meum & ad Deum vestrum*. Aliter enim illi Deus Pater est, aliter nobis. Illum siquidem natura coequat, misericordia humiliat: nos vero natura prostermit, misericordia erigit. *Capitulus Carthag. Epist.*

The fifth and last Assertion followeth, That the Divine essence was so peculiarly communicated to the Word, that there was never any other naturally begotten by the Father; and in that respect *Christ* is the *Onely-begotten* Son of God. For the clearing of which truth, it will first be necessary to enquire into the true notion of the *Onely-begotten*; and then shew how it belongs particularly to *Christ*, by reason of the Divine nature communicated by way of Generation to him alone. First therefore, we must avoid the vain interpretation of the ancient * Hereticks, who would have the restraining term *onely* to belong, not to the Son, but to the Father; as if the *Onely-begotten* were no more then *begotten* of the Father *onely*. Which is both contrary to the language of the Scriptures, and the common custom of men, who use it not for him who is begotten of one, but for him who alone is begotten of any.

Secondly, we must by no means admit the exposition of the † later Here-

* This was the fallacy which Eunomius endeavoured to put upon the Church, as appears by those words of his delivered

and answered by *S. Basil*; *Διὰ τὸτο δὲ, φησὶ, μονογενὴς, ἐπειδὴ πατρὸς μόνου τῷ τῷ ἀφ' οὗ αὐτοῦ δυνάμει γινώσκουσιν καὶ κληθεὶς γινώσκουσιν ὡς γέννηται*: as if *μονογενὴς* were *onely* πατρὸς μόνου, and *unigenitus* were nothing else but *genitus ab uno*. This *S. Basil* refutes copiously: First, from the language of the Scriptures and the usage of mankind; *διὰ τὸ πατρὸς μόνου καὶ τοῦ ὅνομα τῷ μονογενεὶς ἀνακρινόμενον, πατρὸς τε καὶ τοῦ ἀφ' οὗ αὐτοῦ δυνάμει γινώσκουσιν καὶ κληθεὶς γινώσκουσιν ὡς γέννηται*. *Μονογενὴς δὲ οὐκ ὁ πατρὸς μόνου γινώσκουσιν, ἀλλ' ὁ μόνου γινώσκουσιν, ἐν τῇ κοινῇ χριστιανικῇ οὐρανῶν οὐρανῶν οὐρανῶν*. Secondly, by a remark peculiar to that Heresy, which held the Son of God might be called *κληθεὶς* as well as *γεννηθεὶς*, created as well as begotten, and consequently might be as properly named *μονογενὴς* as *μονογενὴς*. *Εἰ μὴ πατρὸς τῷ μόνου γινώσκουσιν, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸ πατρὸς μόνου γινώσκουσιν ὡς γέννηται, ταῦτο δὲ ἐστὶ κατὰ τὸ ἐν τῇ κοινῇ χριστιανικῇ οὐρανῶν οὐρανῶν οὐρανῶν*; Thirdly, by a particular instance shewing the absurdity of such an interpretation, for that thereby no man could properly be called *μονογενὴς*, because not begotten of one, but two parts. *Μονογενὴς δὲ, ὡς ἱσχυαν, ἀφ' οὗ αὐτοῦ δυνάμει γινώσκουσιν καὶ κληθεὶς γινώσκουσιν ὡς γέννηται, διὰ τὸ ἐν κοινῇ χριστιανικῇ οὐρανῶν οὐρανῶν οὐρανῶν*. *ὡς ἡ Σάρρα μήτηρ μονογενὴς καὶ πατρὸς, δὴ καὶ μόνου αὐτῆς, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῷ Ἀβραάμ, ἐπικληθεὶς.*

† The Socinians

Socinians make very much of this Notion, and apply it so unto Christ, as that thereby they might avoid all necessity of an eternall generation. So the Racovian Catechism: Causa cur Christo ista attributa (i.e. proprium & unigenitum Dei Filium esse) competant, hæc est; quod inter omnes Dei filios & præcipuus sit, & Deo charissimus: quemadmodum Isaac, quia Abrahamo charissimus & hæres exstitit, unigenitus vocatus est, Heb. 11. 17. licet fratrem Ismaelem habuerit; & Solomon unigenitus coram matre sua, licet plures ex eadem matre fratres fuerint, 1 Paral. 3. 1, 2, 3, &c. And that this might be applied to the interpretation of the creed, *Sollicitudinis* hath inserted it as a material observation; Nam hic unicus seu unigenita filius nominatur, qui ceteris longe charior est Patri, longeq; præstantior; and confirms the Interpretation with those two testimonies concerning Isaac and Solomon. But certainly this Observation of theirs is vain, or what else they say is false. For if Christ be called the Son of God, because conceived by the Holy Ghost, and none else was ever so conceived, then is he the only-begotten by virtue of his generation. And if so, then is he not the Only-begotten as Isaac and Solomon were, that is, by the affection and prelation of their Parents. Or if Christ were the Only-begotten as Isaac and Solomon were, then was he not conceived after a singular manner, for the brethren of Solomon no way differed from him in their generation. It is plain therefore that this Interpretation was invented that, when all the rest should fail, they might stick to this.

ticks, who take the *Only-begotten* to be nothing else but the most beloved of all the sons; because Isaac was called the *only son* of Abraham, when we know that he had *Ismael* beside, and *Solomon* said to be the *only-begotten before his Mother*, when *David* had other children even by the Mother of *Solomon*. For the *only-begotten* and the *most beloved* are not the same; the one having the nature of a cause in respect of the other, and the same cannot be cause and effect to it self. For though it be true, that the *only son* is the beloved son; yet with this order, that he is therefore beloved because the *only*, not therefore the *only* because beloved. Although therefore *Christ* be the *Only-begotten* and the beloved Son of God, yet we must not look upon these two Attributes as synonymous, or equally significant of the same thing, but as one depending on the other, Unigeniture being the foundation of his singular love. Beside, *Isaac* was called the *only Son* of *Abraham* for some other reason then because he was singularly beloved of *Abraham*; for he was the *only Son* of the free woman, the *only Son* of the promise made to *Abraham*, which was first this, *Sarah shall have a Son*, and then, *In Isaac shall thy seed* Gen. 18. 14. be called. So that *Isaac* may well be called the *only Son* of *Abraham* in reference to the promise, as the Apostle speaks expressly; *By faith Abraham* Heb. 11. 17. *when he was tried offered up Isaac, and he that had received the promises offered up his only-begotten Son*. Avoiding therefore these two expositions, as far short of the true notion of the *only-begotten*, we must look upon it in the most proper, full and significant sense, as signifying a Son so begotten as none other is, was, or can be: so as the term restrictive *only* shall have relation not only to the * Father generating, but also to the Son begotten, and to the manner of the generation. 'Tis true, the Father spake from Heaven, saying, *Thou art my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased*: and thereby we are to understand, that whosoever of us are beloved by the Father are so beloved in and through the Son. In the same manner *Christ* is the *Only-begotten Son* of God; and as many of us as God hath bestowed his love upon, that we should be called the sons of God, are all brought into that near relation by our fellowship with him, who is by a far more near relation the natural and eternall Son.

but μόνον, γέννηται. S. Cyril adds these two πρὸς μόνον and μόνον together, in relation to the Father and the Son: Μονογενὴς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ πατρὸς ἀνθρώπων λόγος, ὅτι μόνον ἐκ μόνου γέννηται τὸ πατρὸς. Epist. 1. ad Regin. As Rufinus doth is Unicus: Ideo subjungit Unicum hunc esse Filium Dei, Unus enim de uno nascitur. Expo. Symb. S. Greg. Naz. adds to these two a third, in respect of the manner: Μονογενὴς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκ μόνου καὶ μόνου, ἀλλ' ὅτι καὶ μονογενὴς, ὡς καὶ τὸ σῶμα. So he something obscurely and corruptly, but plainly enough in Damascene, who aims often to deliver himself in the words of Nazianzen: Λέγεται μονογενὴς, ὅτι μόνον ἐκ μόνου τὸ πᾶν μόνως ἐγεννήθη: ὡς καὶ ὁμοῦται ἐπὶ τῶν γέννησις τῇ τῷ Θεῷ γέννησι, ὡς καὶ ὁμοῦται ἐπὶ τῷ Θεῷ.

Having thus declared the interpretation of the word, that, properly, as Primogeniture consisteth in Prelation, so Unigeniture in Exclusion; and that none can be strictly called the *Only-begotten* but he who alone was so begotten: we shall proceed to make good our Assertion, shewing that the Divine Essence was peculiarly communicated to the Word, by which he was begotten the Son of God, and never any was so begotten beside that Son.

T 2

And

And here we meet with two difficulties: One shewing that there were other sons of God said to be begotten of him, to whom either the Divine essence was communicated; and then the Communication of that to the Word made him not the *Onely-begotten*; or it was not communicated, and then there is no such Communication necessary to found such a Filiation: The other, alledging that the same Divine essence may be communicated to another beside the Word, and not onely that it may, but that it is so, to the Person of the Holy Ghost; whence either the Holy Ghost must be the Son of God, and then the Word is not the *Onely-begotten*; or if he be not the Son, then is not the Communication of the Divine essence a sufficient foundation of the relation of Sonship. These two Objections being answered, nothing will remain farther to demonstrate this last Assertion.

For the first, we acknowledge that others are frequently called the sons of God, and that we call the same God *our Father* which *Christ* called his; that both he that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are all of one, for which cause he is not ashamed to call us brethren: we confess that those whom S. Paul* bath begotten through the Gospel may well be termed the *begotten of God*, whose seed remaineth in them: but withall we affirm that this our Regeneration is of a nature wholly different from the Generation of the Son. We are first † generated, and have our natural being; after that regenerated, and so receive a spiritual renovation, and by virtue thereof an inheritance incorruptible: whereas the Generation of *Christ* admits no Regeneration, he becoming at once thereby God, and Son, and Heir of all. The state of sonship which we come into is but of Adoption, shewing the generation by which we are begotten to be but metaphoricall: whereas *Christ* is so truly begotten, so properly the natural Son of God, that his † generation clearly excludeth the name of Adoption; and not onely so, but when he becometh the son of man, even in his Humanity refuseth the name of an adopted son. For ^a when the fulness of time was come, God sent forth his Son made of a woman, made under the law, To redeem them that were under the law, (not that he, but) that we might receive the adoption of sons. He then whose generation is totally different from ours whom he calleth brethren; he whom in the sacred Scriptures the Spirit nameth the true Son, the Father sometimes his own, sometimes his beloved, but † never his adopted Son; he who by those proper and peculiar appellations is † distinguished from us, who can claim no higher filiation then that which we receive by the privilege of adoption; he is truly the *Onely-begotten Son* of God, notwithstanding the same God hath begotten us by his Word: and the reason why he is so is, because the Divine essence was communicated unto him in his natural and eternall Generation, whereas onely the grace of God is conveyed unto us in our Adoption. Indeed, if we were begotten of the essence of God, as *Christ* was, or he were onely by the grace of God* adopted, as we are, then could he by no propriety of speech be called the *Onely Son*, by reason of so many brethren: but being we cannot aspire unto the first, nor he descend unto the latter, it remaineth we acknowledge him, notwithstanding the first difficulty, by virtue of his natural and peculiar generation, to be the *Onely-begotten Son*.

Heb. 2. 11.

* 1 Cor. 4. 15.

Εν τῷ Χριστῷ

ἡμεῖς ἀδελφοὶ

ἐσμὲν διὰ τὴν

κοινωνίαν τοῦ

αἵματος καὶ τῆς

κλήρονομίας τοῦ

θεοῦ καὶ τῆς

δόξης τοῦ πατρὸς

τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ

τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ

θεοῦ καὶ τῆς

δόξης τοῦ πατρὸς

τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ

τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ

θεοῦ καὶ τῆς

δόξης τοῦ πατρὸς

τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ

τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ

θεοῦ καὶ τῆς

δόξης τοῦ πατρὸς

τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ

τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ

θεοῦ καὶ τῆς

δόξης τοῦ πατρὸς

τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ

τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ

θεοῦ καὶ τῆς

δόξης τοῦ πατρὸς

τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ

τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ

θεοῦ καὶ τῆς

δόξης τοῦ πατρὸς

τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ

τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ

θεοῦ καὶ τῆς

δόξης τοῦ πατρὸς

τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ

τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ

θεοῦ καὶ τῆς

δόξης τοῦ πατρὸς

τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ

τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ

θεοῦ καὶ τῆς

δόξης τοῦ πατρὸς

τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ

τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ

θεοῦ καὶ τῆς

δόξης τοῦ πατρὸς

τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ

τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ

θεοῦ καὶ τῆς

δόξης τοῦ πατρὸς

τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ

τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ

θεοῦ καὶ τῆς

δόξης τοῦ πατρὸς

τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ

τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ

θεοῦ καὶ τῆς

δόξης τοῦ πατρὸς

τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ

τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ

θεοῦ καὶ τῆς

δόξης τοῦ πατρὸς

τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ

τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ

θεοῦ καὶ τῆς

δόξης τοῦ πατρὸς

essemus. Unicum autem genuit, non solum ut Filius esset, quod Pater non est, sed etiam ut Deus esset, quod & Pater est. S. Aug. de Conf. Evangel. l. 2. c. 7. In the book of Celsus there was a Jew introduced (speaking thus to Christ); Εἰ τίς τις λέγεις, ὅτι πᾶς ἀνθρώπος ἔστιν υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, τί ἀνὴρ σὺ ἀλλὰ διαφέρεις; who is thus answered by Origen; Πᾶς ὁ ἐν ἐμῷ, ὅτι πᾶς υἱός, οὐκ ὁ Παῦλος ἀνθρώπων, μήτε ὁ ὑπὸ φόβου παιδαγωγούμενος, ἀλλὰ δι' αὐτὸν τὸ καλὸν αἰρέμενος, οὗς ἐστὶν θεοὶ. ὅσα ἢ πολλὰ καὶ μακρὰ διαφέρει πᾶσις τὸ διὰ τοῦ ἀρετῆς χηρματισμοῦ καὶ τῶν θεῶν, ὅσας ἀσπερίτην καὶ τὴν καὶ ἀρχὴν τῆς πίστεως πυλάται. Orig. adv. Celsum l. 1. First, it is most certain that the word of God, as the word, is not the adopted, but the natural, Son of God. Non est Dei Filius Deus falsus, nec Deus adoptivus, nec Deus nuncupativus, sed Deus verus. S. Hilar. de Trin. l. 5. Hic etiam Filius Dei natura est Filius, non adoptione. Concil. Tolet. 11. Τὸς τῶν θεῶν ἐστὶν υἱός, καὶ ὁ θεός, γεννηθείς ἐκ πατρὸς. S. Cyril. Hierosol. catech. 11. and again, Οὐκ ἐκ τῶν ἐν ὅλῳ εἰς τὸ εἶναι τὸν υἱὸν παρ' ἡμᾶς, ἀλλὰ τὸν καὶ ὅλῳ εἰς τὸ εἶναι τὸν υἱὸν παρ' ἡμᾶς. ἀλλὰ αὐτὸς ὁ πατὴρ αὐτὸς

αὐτὸς ἐγεννητὸς καὶ ἀνεκφραστὸς ὑπὸν ἑνα μόνον, ἀδελφὸν ἐκ ἑσθίας. This hath been so generally confessed, that Felix and Elipadus, who were condemned for maintaining Christ as man to be the adopted Son of God, did acknowledge it; as appeareth by the beginning of their Book, Confitemur & credimus Deum, Dei Filium, ante omnia tempora sine initio ex Patre genitum, coeternum & consubstantiali-tem, non adoptione, sed genere. Secondly, it is also certain, that the Man Christ Jesus taken personally is the natural, not the adopted, Son of God: because the Man Christ Jesus is no other person than the Word, who is the eternal and natural Son, and by subsisting in the hu-mane nature could not leave off to be the natural Son. The deniall of this by Felix and Elipadus was condemned as Hereticall in the Council of Francford; and their Opinion was thus expressed, partly in the words of S. Augustine, partly in their own additions: Con-fitemur & credimus eum factum ex muliere, factum sub Lege; non genere esse filium Dei, sed adoptione, non natura, sed gratis. This they maintained by forged testimonies of some Fathers, and by the Liturgy of the Church of Toledo, composed by Hildephardus, as the Roman by Gregory: in the Mass de Canna Domini, Qui per adoptivi hominis passionem, dum suo non indullit corpori; and in the Mass de Ascensione Domini, Hodie Salvator noster, per adoptionem carnis, sedem reperivit Deitatis. To this the Synod opposed their determination in Sacrosyllabo; Quod ex te nascetur sanctum vocabitur filius Dei, non adoptivus, sed verus, non alienus, sed proprius. and again; Porro adoptivus dici non potest qui alienus est ab eo à quo dicitur adoptatus; & gratis ei adoptio tribuitur, quoniam non ex debito, sed ex indulgentia tantummodo, adoptio praestatur: sicut nos aliquando cum effemus peccando filii ire, alieni eramus à Deo, per proprium & verum Filium, qui non eguit adoptione, adoptio nobis filiorum donata est. And of this they give us the true ground in the Synodic Epistle; Unitas personae quae est in Dei filio & filio Virginis adoptionis tollit in-juriam. * Gal. 4. 5. † Legi & relegi Scripturas, Jesum Filium Dei nusquam adoptione inveni. Ambrosaster Com. in Ep. ad Rom. Dices mihi, Cur times adoptivum Christum Dominum nominare? Dico tibi, Quia nec Apostoli eum sic nomi-narunt, nec sancta Dei & Catholica Ecclesia consuetudinem habuit sic eum appellare. Synod. Epist. Concil. Francford. From whence they charge all those to whom they write that Synodic Epistle, that they should be satisfied with such expressions as they found in the Scriptures: Intelligite, fratres, quae legitis, & nolite nova & incognita nomina fingere, sed quae in S. Scriptura inveniuntur tenere, &c. † S. Aug. hath observed that S. Paul made use of ὁδοποιεῖν, that he might distinguish the filiation of Christ from ours. At vero etiam nos, quibus dedit Deus potestatem filios ejus fieri, de natura atque substantia sua non nos genuit, sicut uni-cum Filium, sed utrique dilectione adoptavit. Quo verbo Apostolus saepe uti non ob aliud intelligitur, nisi ad discernendum Uni-genitum. De consens. Evang. l. 2. c. 3. And S. Ambrose takes notice, that the name of true destroyeth that of adopted: Adoptivum filium non dicimus filium esse natura, sed eum dicimus natura esse filium qui verus est filius. De Incarn. Sacr. c. 8. * Si unicus, quomodo adoptivus, dum multi sunt adoptivi filii? Unicus itaque de multis non potest dici. Concil. Francos. Quod si etiam Unigenitus Filius factus dicitur ex gratia, non vere genitus ex natura, proculdubio nomen & veritatem Unigeniti perdi-dit, postquam fratres habere jam cepit: privatur enim hujus veritate nominis, si in Unigenito non est de Patre veritas natura-lis. Fulgentius ad Thrasim. l. 3. c. 3. Si divina illa Filii sempiternaque nativitas non de natura Dei Patris, sed ex gratia, creditur substituisse, non debet Unigenitus vocari, sed tantummodo genitus. Quoniam sicut ei nomen geniti largitas adoptionis paternae contribuit, sic eum ab Unigeniti nomine nobis quoque tributa communio paternae adoptionis excludit. Unigenitus enim non vocatur, quamvis genitus possit vocari, cum genitis. Ib. c. 4.

But though neither men nor Angels be begotten of the substance of God, or by virtue of any such natural generation be called sons; yet one person we know, to whom the Divine essence is as truly and really communicated by the Father as to the Son, which is the third Person in the blessed Trinity, the Holy Ghost. Why then should the Word by that Communication of the Di-vine essence become the Son, and not the Holy Ghost by the same? or if, by receiving the same nature, he also be the Son of God, how is the Word the *only Son*? To this I answer, that the Holy Ghost receiveth the same essence from the Father which the Word receiveth, and thereby becometh the same God with the Father and the Word: but though the essence be the same which is communicated, yet there is a difference in the communication; the Word being God by Generation, the Holy Ghost by Procession: and though * every thing which is begotten proceedeth, yet every thing which procee-deth is not begotten. Wherefore, in the language of the sacred Scriptures and the † Church, the Holy Ghost is never said to be begotten, but to pro-ceed from the Father; nor is he ever called the Son, but the Gift of God. Eve was produced out of Adam, and in the same nature with him, and yet was not born of him, nor was she truly the daughter of Adam; whereas Seth pro-ceeding from the same person, in the similitude of the same nature, was truly and properly the Son of Adam. And this difference was not in the nature produced, but in the manner of production; Eve descending not from Adam, as Seth did, by way of generation, that is, by natural fecundity. The Holy

* Non omne id quod pro-cedit nasci-tur, sicut om-ne id quod nascitur pro-cedit. S. Aug. contra Max. l. 3. c. 14. who gives the same solution to the same Argu-ment: Queris à me, si de substantia Patris est Fi-

lius, de substantia Patris est etiam Spiritus Sanctus, cur unus Filius sit, & alius non sit Filius. Ego respondeo, si ve capias, si ve non capias; De Patre est Filius, de Patre est Spiritus S. sed ille genitus est, iste procedens. Πολλὰ τέτα πλάσθησαν τὸ εἶναι, ἔξ ἐκείνου γὰρ ὁ ἀγεννητὸς οὐκ αὐτὸν τὸν Λόγον καὶ τὸ Ἄγιον Πνεῦμα· τὸν μὲν, ὡς Λόγον, ἐκ τοῦ τοῦ γεννηθέντος· τὸ δὲ, ὡς Πνεῦμα, ἐκ τοῦ ἀγεννηθέντος καὶ τὸν Λόγον τὸ Πνεῦμα, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ἀγεννηθέντος, ἀλλὰ ἑωυτοῦ, καὶ παρ' ἐκείνου. Θεοδωρετ. Serm. 2. p. 504. † Nunquam fuit non Pater, à quo Filius natus, à quo Spiritus Sanctus non natus, quia non est Filius. Gennad. De Eccles. Dog. Deus Pater innascibilis non ex aliquo, Deus Filius unigenitus ex aliquo, hoc est, ex Patre, Spi-ritus S. innascibilis ex aliquo, hoc est, ex Patre. Isaac. lib. Fidei. Quod neque natum neque factum est, Spiritus S. est, qui à Patre & Filio procedit. S. Ambr. in Symb.

Ghost proceedeth from the Father in the same nature with him, the Word proceedeth from the same Person in the same similitude of nature also; but the Word proceeding is the Son, the Holy Ghost is not, because the first procession is by way of Generation, the other is not. As therefore the Regeneration and Adoption of man, so the Procession of the Holy Ghost doth no way prejudice the eternall Generation, as pertaining solely to the Son of God.

Seeing then our Saviour *Jesus Christ* had a real being and existence before he was conceived by the Virgin *Mary*; seeing the being which he had antecedently to that Conception was not any created, but the one and indivisible Divine, essence; seeing he had not that Divinity of himself originally, as the Father, but by communication from him; seeing the communication of the same essence unto him was a proper Generation; we cannot but believe that the same *Jesus Christ* is the begotten Son of God: and seeing the same essence was never so by way of Generation communicated *unto any, we must also acknowledge him the *Only-begotten*, distinguished from the Holy Ghost, as Son, from the Adopted children, as the Natural Son.

* Ως ὁ υἱὸς τῆς
ἐκείνης, οὐκ ὡς
πατέρι τῷ
αὐτῷ πατρὶ
ᾧ μόνον γεννῶντι,
ἀλλὰ ὡς ὁ
ἑαυτοῦ συ-
λαβὼν, ὁ
υἱὸς καὶ λαμβαν-
τὸν πατέρα.
S. Basil Hom. de
Fide.

* Heb. 10. 4.

* 1 Cor. 6. 20.
and 7. 23.

* 1 Pet. 1. 19.

* Acts 26. 28.

* Heb. 9. 14.

The necessity of the belief of this part of the Article, that *Jesus Christ* is the proper and natural Son of God, begotten of the substance of the Father, and by that singular way of Generation the *Only Son*, appeareth first in the confirmation of our Faith concerning the Redemption of mankind. For this doth shew such an excellency and dignity in the person of the Mediatour as will assure us of an infinite efficacy in his Actions, and value in his Sufferings. We know ^a it is not possible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sins: and we may very well doubt how the blood of him who hath no other nature then that of man can take away the sins of other men; there appearing no such difference as will shew a certainty in the one, and an impossibility in the other. But since we may be ^a bought with a price, well may we believe the blood of *Christ* sufficiently ^b precious, when we are assured that it is the ^c blood of God: nor can we question the efficacy of it in ^d purging our conscience from dead works, if we believe *Christ* offered up himself through the eternall Spirit. If we be truly sensible of our sins, we must acknowledge that in every one we have offended God; and the gravity of every offence must needs increase proportionably to the dignity of the party offended in respect of the offender; because the more worthy any person is, the more reverence is due unto him, and every injury tendeth to his dishonour: but between God and man there is an infinite disproportion; and therefore every offence committed against him must be esteemed as in the highest degree of injurie. Again, as the gravity of the offence beareth proportion to the person offended; so the value of reparation ariseth from the dignity of the person satisfying: because the satisfaction consisteth in a reparation of that honour which by the injurie was eclipsed; and all honour doth encrease proportionably as the person yielding it is honourable. If then by every sin we have offended God, who is of infinite eminency, according unto which the injury is aggravated; how shall we ever be secure of our reconciliation unto God, except the person who hath undertaken to make the reparation be of the same infinite dignity, so as the honour rendred by his obedience may prove proportionable to the offence and that dishonour which arose from our disobedience? This scruple is no otherwise to be satisfied then by a belief in such a Mediatour as is the *Only-begotten Son* of God, of the same substance with the Father, and consequently of the same power and dignity with the God whom by our sins we have offended.

Secondly, The belief of the eternall Generation of the Son, by which he is

is the same God with the Father, is necessary for the confirming and encouraging a Christian in ascribing that honour and glory unto *Christ* which is due unto him. For we are commanded to give that Worship unto the Son which is truly and properly Divine; the same which we give unto God the Father, who *hath committed all judgment unto the Son, that all men should honour the Son even as they honour the Father.* As it was represented to S. *John* in a vision, when he heard every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, saying, Blessing, honour, glory, and power be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb, for ever and ever. Again, we are commanded to fear the Lord our God, and to † serve him; and that with such an emphasis, as by him we are to understand him alone, because the Lord our God is one Lord. From whence, if any one arose among the Jews teaching under the title of a Prophet to worship any other beside him for God, the judgment of the * Rabbins was, that notwithstanding all the Miracles which he could work, though they were as great as *Moses* wrought, he ought immediately to be strangled, because the evidence of this truth, that One God only must be worshipped, is above all evidence of sense. Nor must we look upon this Precept as valid only under the Law, as if then there were only one God to be worshipped, but since the Gospel we had another; for our Saviour hath commended it to our observation, by making use of it against the Devil in his temptation, saying, * Get thee hence, Satan, for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve. If then we be obliged to worship the God of Israel only, if we be also commanded to give the same Worship to the Son which we give to him; it is necessary that we should believe that the Son is the God of Israel. ^b When the Scripture bringeth in the first begotten into the world, it saith, Let all the Angels of God worship him; but then the same Scripture calleth that first begotten ^c *Jehovah*, and the Lord of the whole earth. For a man to worship that for God which is not God, knowing that it is not God, is affected and gross Idolatry; to worship that as God which is not God, thinking that it is God, is not the same degree, but the same sin; to worship him as God who is God, thinking that he is not God, cannot be thought an act in the formality void of Idolatry. Left therefore, while we are all obliged to give unto him Divine worship, we should fall into that sin which of all others we ought most to abhor, it is no less necessary that we should believe that Son to be that eternall God, whom we are bound to worship, and whom only we should serve.

Thirdly, Our belief in *Christ* as the eternall Son of God is necessary, to raise us unto a thankfull acknowledgment of the infinite love of God appearing in the sending of his only-begotten Son into the world to die for sinners. This love of God is frequently extolled and admired by the Apostles. ^d God so loved the world, saith S. *John*, that he gave his only-begotten Son. ^e God commendeth his love towards us, saith S. *Paul*, in that while we were yet sinners *Christ* died for us; in that he spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all. ^f In this, saith S. *John* again, was manifested the love of God towards us, because that God sent his only-begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him. Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins. If we look upon all this as nothing else, but that God should cause a man to be born after another manner than other men, and when he was so born after a peculiar manner, yet a mortal man, should deliver him to die for the sins of the world; I see no such great expression of his love in this way of redemption, more than would have appeared if he had redeemed us any other way. 'Tis true indeed, that the reparation of lapsed man is no act of absolute necessity in respect of God, but that he hath as freely de-

Joh. 5. 22, 23.

Rev. 5. 13.

Deut. 6. 13, 4.

† The emphasis appears in this, that it is not barely

וְעָבַדוּ & services ci,

בְּאֵין וְעָבַדוּ

& iph services,

with such a

peculiar re-

striction as is

expressed by

the Chaldee

Paraph.

וְעָבַדוּ

וְעָבַדוּ

& in conspe-

ctu ejus ser-

vices, by the

Lxx. ὁ αὐτοῦ

κύριος λατρεύ-

σας* and that

restriction ap-

proved by our

Saviour,

Matt. 4. 10.

* Moses

Maim. Pref.

in Seder Ze-

raim.

* Matt. 4. 10.

* Heb. 1. 6.

* Psal. 97. 5.

Εἰς μονο-

κύριον ἔστιν,

ὁ κύριος ὁ ὁ κύριος;

ἰσχυρίαν λέει

ἐχρησάμενος

ἐν ἑαυτῷ καὶ

ἐν ἑαυτῷ καὶ

ἐν ἑαυτῷ καὶ

ἐν ἑαυτῷ καὶ

ἐν ἑαυτῷ καὶ

ἐν ἑαυτῷ καὶ

ἐν ἑαυτῷ καὶ

ἐν ἑαυτῷ καὶ

ἐν ἑαυτῷ καὶ

ἐν ἑαυτῷ καὶ

ἐν ἑαυτῷ καὶ

ἐν ἑαυτῷ καὶ

ἐν ἑαυτῷ καὶ

ἐν ἑαυτῷ καὶ

ἐν ἑαυτῷ καὶ

ἐν ἑαυτῷ καὶ

ἐν ἑαυτῷ καὶ

ἐν ἑαυτῷ καὶ

ἐν ἑαυτῷ καὶ

ἐν ἑαυτῷ καὶ

ἐν ἑαυτῷ καὶ

ἐν ἑαυτῷ καὶ

ἐν ἑαυτῷ καὶ

ἐν ἑαυτῷ καὶ

ἐν ἑαυτῷ καὶ

ἐν ἑαυτῷ καὶ

designed our Redemption as our Creation; considering the misery from which we are redeemed, and the happiness to which we are invited, we cannot but acknowledge the singular love of God even in the act of Redemption it self: but yet the Apostles have raised that consideration higher, and placed the choicest mark of the love of God in the chusing such means and performing in that manner our reparation, by sending his *Onely-begotten* into the world, by not sparing his own Son, by giving and delivering him up to be scourged and crucified for us: and the estimation of this act of God's love must necessarily increase proportionably to the dignity of the Son so sent into the world; because the more worthy the person of *Christ* before he suffered, the greater his condescension unto such a suffering condition; and the nearer his relation to the Father, the greater his love to us for whose sakes he sent him so to suffer. Wherefore to derogate any way from the Person and nature of our Saviour before he suffered, is so far to undervalue the love of God, and, consequently, to come short of that acknowledgment and thanksgiving which is due unto him for it. If then the sending of *Christ* into the world were the highest act of the love of God which could be expressed; if we be obliged unto a return of thankfulness some way correspondent to such infinite love; if such a return can never be made without a true sense of that infinity, and a sense of that infinity of love cannot consist without an apprehension of an infinite dignity of nature in the Person sent: then it is absolutely necessary to believe that *Christ* is so the *Onely-begotten Son* of the Father, as to be of the same substance with him, of glory equal, of Majesty co-eternal.

By this discourse in way of explication every Christian may understand what it is he says, and express his mind how he would be understood, when he maketh this brief Confession, I believe in *Christ the onely Son* of God. For by these words he must be thought to intend no less then this: I do profess to be fully assured of this Assertion as of a most certain, infallible and necessary truth, That *Jesus Christ*, the Saviour and *Messias*, is the true, proper and natural Son of God, begotten of the substance of the Father; which, being incapable of division or multiplication, is so really and totally communicated to him, that he is of the same essence with him, *God of God, light of light, very God of very God*. And as I assert him so to be the Son, so do I also exclude all other persons from that kind of Sonship, acknowledging none but him to be begotten of God by that proper and natural generation; and thereby excluding all which are not begotten, as it is a generation; all which are said to be begotten, and are called sons, but are so onely by adoption, as 'tis natural. And thus I believe in God the Father, and in *Jesus Christ* his *Onely Son*.

OUR LORD.

† For though in the first Rules of Faith mentioned by Irenaeus and Tertullian we find not Dominum nostrum, yet in all the

After our Saviour's Relation founded upon his eternall Generation, followeth his Dominion, † in all ancient Creeds, as the necessary consequent of his Filiation. For as we believe him to be the Son of God, so must we acknowledge him to be *our Lord*, because the onely Son must of necessity be Heir and Lord of all in his Father's house; and all others which bear the name of sons, whether they be men or Angels, if compared to him, must not be looked upon as sons of God, but as servants of *Christ*.

Creeds afterwards we find those words; probably inserted because denied by the *Valentinians*, of whom Irenaeus, *Διὰ τὸν τὸν Σωτῆρα ἡγούμενον, ὃς δὲ ὁ Κύριος ὀνομάσθην αὐτὸν δίδωσι*. l. i. c. i.

First then, we must observe that not only *Christ* is *the Lord*, but that this title doth so properly belong unto him, that *the Lord* alone absolutely taken is † frequently used by the Evangelists and Apostles determinately for *Christ*, infomuch that the Angels observe that dialect, *“Come, see the place where the Lord lay.* Now for the true Notation of the word, it will ¶ not be so necessary to enquire into the use or origination of the *Greek*, much less into the Etymology of the correspondent *Latine*, as to search into the Notion of the *Jews*, and the Language of the Scriptures, according unto which the Evangelists and Apostles spake and wrote.

† May. 16, 19,
20. Luke 12.
47. and 24.
34. Job. 4. 1.
and 6. 23. and
11. 2. and 20.
3. 18, 20, 25.
and 21. 7.
Acts 9. 1, 6,
10, 11, 15,
17. 27, 31,
42. and II.
16, 24. and
13. 47. &c.
Kuenz. —
† Matt. 28. 6.
¶ For whoso-
ever shall
consider the
signification of
Kuenz. in
the Scriptures,
I think he will
scarce find any

Kúelos γυναικός ἐξ ὧν ἀνήρ ἐστι πατήρ, ἡσυχίᾳ δὲ ἀπογορεύεται. * As מֵאָרַם is generally translated κύεος, when it signifies Lord or Master in respect of a Servant or inferior. So Sarah called her husband, Gen.18.12. 1 Pet. 3.6. so Eleazer his Master Abraham, Gen.24.frequently. Thus Rachel saluted her Father Laban, Gen.31.35. and Jacob his brother Esau, Gen.33.8. Potiphar is the κύεος of Joseph whom he bought, Gen.39.2.&c. and Joseph in power is so saluted by his brethren, Gen.42.12. and acknowledged by his servant, 44-5. The general name in the Law of Masters for Servant and Master is παῖς and κύεος, Exod.21.2,4. It is indeed so plain that the ancient Jews used this word to signify no more than humane power, that we find מֶלֶךְ the name of man so translated, as 1 Sam.17.32. וְיָדָע לְבָ אָדָם לֹב אִתּוֹ מֶלֶךְ (κατανοήτω κατὰ τὸν οὐρανὸν οὗτον κύεον μετ' αὐτόν). † For κύεος is used with relation and in opposition to παιδίασαν, Acts 16.16. in the sense which the later, not the ancient, Greeks used it : Παιδίασαν, τὸν ὅτι στεγάζουσιν οἱ νῦν κληθῆναι οἱ ἐξ ἀρχαίων ὁμοὶ νεανίδας; si Phynichus observes, as it is opposed to οἰκίας, Luke 16.13.(according to that of Etymol. Κύεος τίς οἷς τὸν δεῖν, ἐχέῃ τις οἷς τὸν κλίσιν.) τοῦ δεῖν, Matt.10.24. and 18.25. &c. And in the Apostolicall rules pertaining to Christian Oeconomicks, the Master and Servant are δούλος and κύεος. As also by way of addition κύεος τῷ δεσποτῇ, Matt.9.38. κύεος τῷ ἀμπαύωνι, Matt. 20. 8. κύεος τῷ οἰκίᾳ, Mark 13.35. Inasmuch as κύεος is sometimes used by way of address or salutation of one man to another, (as it is now generally among the later Greeks, and as Dominus was anciently among the Latines, Quomodo obvios, si nomen non occurrat, Dominos salutamus. Sen.) not only of Servants to Masters, as Matt. 13.27. or Sons to Parents, as Matt.21.20. or inferiours to men in authority, as Matt.27.63. but of Strangers 3 as when the Greeks spake to Philip, and desired him, saying, Κύεος, ἀκούειν τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἱερέα, Joh.12.21. and Mary Magdalene speaking unto Christ, but taking him for a gardener, Κύεος, εἰ σὺ ἐδάσσαυ αὐτόν, John 20.15. And it cannot be denied but this title was sometimes given to our Saviour himself in no higher or other sense then this : As when the Samaritan woman saw him alone at the well, and knew no more of him then that he appeared to be one of the Jews, she said, Κύεος, ἀνταμίαν ἐν ἔχῃς, καὶ ποτε οὐκ ἔβασεν βαθεῖν, Joh. 4.11. And the infirm man at the pool of Bethesda, when he wist not who it was, said unto him, Κύεος, ἀράβαινε ἐν ἔχῃ, Joh. 5.7. The blind man, to whom he had restored his sight, with the same salutation maketh confession of his ignorance, and his faith, Τίς εἶπες, Κύεος 3 and, μετὰ ταῦτα Κύεος, Joh. 9.36, 38. * 1 Cor.8.5. † Ib.v.6. and Eph.4.5. † Coloss.3.22. † 1 Cor.2.8. and 15.47. † Rev.19.16.

Nor is it difficult to find that Name amongst the books of the Law in the most high and full signification; for it is most frequently used as the name of the supreme God, sometimes for *El* or *Elohim*, sometimes for *Shaddai* or the *Rock*, often for *Adonai*, and most universally for *Jehovah*, the undoubted proper name of God, and that to which the *Greek Translatours*, long before our Saviour's birth, had most appropriated the name of *Lord*, not only by way of explication, but distinction and particular expression. As when we read, *Thou, whose name alone is Jehovah, art the most high in all the earth*; and when God so expresseth himself, *I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, by the name of God almighty; but by my name Jehovah was I not known unto them*. In both these places, for the name *Jehovah*, the *Greek Translation*, which the Apostles followed, hath no other name but *Lord*; and therefore undoubtedly by that word which we translate *the Lord* did they understand the proper name of God, *Jehovah*. And had they placed it there as the exposition of any other name of God, they had made an interpretation contrary to the manifest intention of the Spirit: for it cannot be denied but God was known to *Abraham* by the true importance of the title *Adonai*, as much as by the name of *Shaddai*; as much by his Dominion and Sovereignty, as by his Power and All-sufficiency: but by any experimental and personal sense of

Psal. 83. 18.

Exod. 6. 3.

† I know it is the vulgar opinion, that *Kúeios* answereth unto *אֲדֹנָי*, and the reason why it was also used for *יְהוָה* is no other then, because the Jews were wont to read *Adonai* in the place of *Jehovah*. Of

which Observation they make great use who deny the Divinity of Christ. Quia enim Adonai pro Jehovah in lectione Hebræorum verborum substitui consuevit, ideo illius etiam interpretatio huic accommodatur, says Crillius de Deo & Attr. c. 14. But first, it is not probable that the LXX should think *Kúeios* to be the proper interpretation of *אֲדֹנָי*, and give it to *Jehovah* only in the place of *Adonai*; for if they had, it would have followed, that where *Adonai* and *Jehovah* had met together in one sentence, they would not have put another word for *Adonai*, to which *Kúeios* was proper, and place *Kúeios* for *Jehovah*, to whom of itself (according to their observation) it did not belong. Whereas we read not only *יְהוָה אֲדֹנָי* translated *Κύριος Αδωναι*, Gen. 15. 2. and *יְהוָה אֲדֹנָי* translated *Κύριος Αδωναι*, Nehem. 10. 29. Secondly, the reason of this assertion is most uncertain. For though it be confessed that the Masoreths did read *אֲדֹנָי* where they found *יְהוָה*, and Josephus before them expresses the sense of the Jews of his age, that the *ῥησέως* was not to be pronounced, and before him Philo speaks as much; yet it followeth not from thence, that the Jews were so superstitious above 300 years before; which must be proved, before we can be assured that the LXX read *Adonai* for *Jehovah*, and for that reason translated it *Kúeios*. Thirdly, as we know no reason why the Jews should so confound the names of God; so were it now very irrational in some places to read *אֲדֹנָי* for *יְהוָה*. As when God saith, *I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, by the name of God almighty*, though the Vulgar Translation reader it, in Deo omnipotent, et nomen meum Adonai non indicavimus, and thereby make an apparent sense no way congruous to the intended importance of the Holy Ghost; (for it cannot be imagined either that God should not be known to Abraham by the name *Adonai*, or that it were any thing to the present intentment, which was to encourage Moses and the Israelites by the interpretation of the name *Jehovah*) yet we have no reason to believe that the LXX made any such heterogeneous translation, which we read *Κύριος Αδωναι* in *Κύριος Αδωναι*. Thus again, where God speaks unto Moses, *Οὗτος ὁ ὄνομα τοῦ ἁγίου τοῦ ὀνόματος*, Exod. 3. 15. whoever thinks *Kúeios* stands for *Adonai* does injury to the Translatours; and whoever readeth *Adonai* for *Jehovah* puts a force upon the Text. As also where the Prophet David saith, *Thou, whose name alone is Jehovah, art the most high over all the earth*. I confess the ancient Fathers did together with the Jews read *Adonai* for *Jehovah* in the Hebrew Text, as appeareth by those words of Epiphanius de Ponderibus, *Αδωναι, ἱσχυρὰ, ἰσχυρὰ, ἰσχυρὰ, ἰσχυρὰ*, which very corruptly represent part of the first verse of the 141. Psalm, *יְהוָה קְרֹאֵן חֲשִׁיב לִי הָאוֹיֵב קוֹלִי*, but plainly enough reader *אֲדֹנָי*. Notwithstanding it is very observable, that they were wont to distinguish *Kúeios*, in the Greek translations, where it stood for *Jehovah*, from *Kúeios* where it stood for *Adonai*; and that was done by adding in the margin the Tetragrammaton itself, *יְהוָה*, which by the ignorance of the Greek Scribes, who understood not the Hebrew Characters, was converted into four Greek letters, and so made a word of no signification, *ΙΗΟΥ*. This is still extant in the Copy of the Text of Isaiah printed by Curterius with the Commentary of Procopius; and S. Hierome gives an account of it in the Greek Copies of his age, Nonum *ῥησέως*, quod *ἄνεκον*, id est, ineffabile, putaverunt, quod his literis scribitur, *jod he va u he he*: quod quidam non intelligentes, propter elementorum similitudinem, cum in Græcis libris repererint, Pipi legere consueverunt. Ep. 136. Neither did the Greeks only place this *ΙΗΟΥ* in the margin of their Translations, but when they described the Hebrew Text in Greek Characters, they used the same *ΙΗΟΥ* for *יְהוָה*, and consequently did not read *Adonai* for *Jehovah*. An example of this is to be found in that excellent Copy of the Prophets according to the LXX, collated with the rest of the Translatours, in the Library of the most eminent Cardinal Barberini; where at the 13. verse of the second Chap. of Malachi these words are written after the Translation of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, out of the Hebrew Text, after the manner of Origen's Hexapla, of which there is an excellent example in that MS. *Οὗτος ὁ ὄνομα τοῦ ἁγίου τοῦ ὀνόματος*, which are a very proper expression of these following Hebrew words, according to the punctuation and reading of that Age, *יְהוָה אֲדֹנָי*, which are a very proper expression of these following Hebrew words, according to the punctuation and reading of that Age, *יְהוָה אֲדֹנָי*. By which 'tis evident that Origen in his Hexapla, from whence undoubtedly that ancient Scholiast took his various Translations, did not read *Αδωναι* in that place, but kept the Hebrew Characters, which they who understood them not formed into those Greek letters *ΙΗΟΥ*. And certainly the preserving of the name *Jehovah* in the Greek Translations was very ancient; for it was described in some of them with the ancient Characters, as S. Hierome testifieth, Et nomen Domini Tetragrammaton in quibusdam Græcis voluminibus usque hodie antiquius expressum literis invenimus. Ep. 106. Being then we cannot be assured that the LXX read *אֲדֹנָי* for *יְהוָה*; being they have used *εἰς* for *Jehovah*, when they have made use of the general word *Θεός* for *Adonai*; being in some places *Adonai* cannot be read for *Jehovah*, without manifest violence offered to the Text: it followeth, that it is no way probable that *Kúeios* should therefore be used for *Jehovah*, because it was taken for the proper signification of *Adonai*.

the

Being then this title *Lord* thus signifieth the proper name of God *Jehovah*; being the same is certainly attributed unto *Christ* in a notion far surpassing all other Lords, which are rather to be looked upon as Servants unto him: it will be worth our enquiry next, whether as it is the Translation of the name *Jehovah* it belong to *Christ*; or whether, though he be Lord of all other Lords, as subjected under his authority, yet he be so inferiour unto him whose name alone is *Jehovah*, as that in that propriety and eminency in which it belongs unto the supreme God it may not be attributed unto *Christ*.

This doubt will easily be satisfied, if we can shew the name *Jehovah* it self to be given unto our Saviour; it being against all reason to acknowledge the original name, and to deny the interpretation in the sense and full importance of that original. Wherefore if *Christ* be the *Jehovah*, as so called by the Spirit of God; then is he so the *Lord*, in the same propriety and eminency in which *Jehovah* is. Now whatsoever did belong to the *Messias*, that may and must be attributed unto *Jesus*, as being the true and onely *Christ*. But the *Jews* themselves acknowledge that *Jehovah* shall be known clearly in the days

* As Midrasch
Yillim on 21.
Psal. Eccl.
Kabat Lam.
1.6.

Isa. 8. 13, 14.

* Rom. 9. 33.

* Hof. 1. 7.

where it is
farther ob-
servable, that
the Chaldee
Paraphrase
hath
במִסְתָּרָא
for
בְּיָהוָה
by the word
of Jehovah,
for Jehovah.

* Acts 4. 12.

* Zach. 10. 12.

* Deut. 6. 4.

† Two Adver-
saries we
have to the
exposition of
this place, the
Jew, and the
Socinian; onely
with this dif-
ference, that
we find the less
opposition
from the Jew,
from whom
indeed we
have so ample
a concession as
will destroy
the other's
contradiction.
First Socinus

answers, the name belongeth not to *Christ*, but unto *Israel*; and that it so appears by a parallel place in the same Prophet, Jer. 33. 15, 16. Socin. refut. Jac. Wicki. cap. 6. Catech. Racov. de Pers. Christi, c. 1. Crill. de Deo & Attrib. l. 1. c. 11. To this we first oppose the con-
stant

of the *Messias*, and not onely so, but that it is the * name which properly be-
longeth to him. And if they cannot but confess so much who onely reade
the Prophecies, as the Eunuch did, without an interpreter; how can we be
ignorant of so plain and necessary a truth, whose eyes have seen the full
completion, and read the infallible interpretation of them? If they could see
Jehovah the Lord of hosts to be the name of the *Messias*, who was to them for a
stone of stumbling and rock of offence; how can we possibly be ignorant of it,
who are taught by S. Paul, that in *Christ* this prophecy was fulfilled, * As it is
written, Behold, I lay in Sion a stumbling-stone and rock of offence, and whosoever
believeth on him shall not be ashamed? It was no other then *Jehovah* who spake
those words, * I will have mercy upon the house of Judah, and will save them by
the Lord (Jehovah) their God, and will not save them by bow nor sword.
Where not onely he who is described as the original and principal cause,
that is, the Father who gave his Son, but also he who is the immediate effici-
ent of our Salvation, and that in opposition to all other means or instrumental
causes, is called *Jehovah*; who can be no other then our *Jesus*, because * there
is no other name under heaven given unto men whereby we must be saved. As in
another place he speaketh, * I will strengthen them in the Lord (Jehovah,) and
they shall walk up and down in his name, saith the Lord (Jehovah;) where he
which strengtheneth is one, and he by whom he strengtheneth is another,
clearly distinguished from him by the personal Pronoun, and yet each of them
is *Jehovah*, and * *Jehovah* our God is one *Jehovah*. Whatsoever † objections may
be framed against us, we know *Christ* is the † righteous branch raised unto Da-
vid, the King that shall reign and prosper, in whose days Judah shall be saved, and
Israel shall dwell safely; we are assured that this is his name whereby he shall be
called, The Lord our Righteousness: the Lord, that is, *Jehovah*, the expression
of his Supremacy; and the addition of *Our righteousness* can be no diminution
to his Majesty. If those words in the Prophet, * Sing and rejoyce, O daughter
of Sion, for lo, I come, and I dwell in the midst of thee, saith the Lord (Jehovah,)
did not sufficiently of themselves denote our Saviour who dwelt amongst us,
as they certainly do; yet the words which follow would evince as much,
And many nations shall be joyned to the Lord in that day, and shall be my people;
and I will dwell in the midst of thee, and thou shalt know that the Lord of hosts
hath sent me unto thee: for what other Lord can we conceive dwelling in the
midst of us, and sent unto us by the Lord of hosts, but *Christ*?

stant interpretation of the Jews, who attribute the name Jehovah to the Messiah from this one particular Text. As in the Sepher Itharim, l. 2. c. 8. ויקרא הכתוב שם המשיח וי"י צדקנו. The Scripture calleth the name of the Messiah Jehovah our righteousness. And in Midrash Tiltam on Psal. 21. יהוה אש שמו אשר יקראו יהוה צדקנו. מה שמו של משיח אל אבא יהוה שמו ש"ן וזה שמו אשר יקראו יהוה צדקנו. God calleth the Messiah by his own name, and his name is Jehovah; as it is said (Exod. 15. 3.) The Lord is a man of war, Jehovah is his name. And it is written of the Messiah, (Jer. 23. 6.) And this is the name which they shall call him, Jehovah our righteousness. Thus Echa Rabati, Law. 1. 6. מה שמו של משיח אל אבא יהוה שמו ש"ן וזה שמו אשר יקראו יהוה צדקנו. What is the name of the Messiah? R. Abba said, Jehovah is his name; as it is said, (Jer. 23. 6.) And this is the name which they shall call him, Jehovah our righteousness. The same he reports of Rabbi Levi. The Rabbins then, though enemies to the truth which we deduce from thence, constrained by the literal importance of the Text, did acknowledge that the name Jehovah did belong to the Messiah. And as for the collection of the contrary from the parallel place pretended, there is not so great a similitude as to enforce the same interpretation. For whereas in the 23. 6. of Jeremiah it is expressly said, שמו יהוה this is the name, in the 33. it is only יהוה, without any mention of a name; and surely that place cannot prove Jehovah to be the name of Israel, which speaks not one word of the name of Jerusalem: for where we read in Crellius, hoc scilicet nomen est, all but hoc is not Scripture, but the gloss of Crellius, and hoc it self cannot be warranted for the interpretation of יהוה, nor quo for אשר; the simplest interpretation of those words יהוה אשר יהוה אשר, being, iste qui vocabitur eam, he which calleth Jerusalem is the Lord our righteousness, that is, Christ. And thus the first answer of Socinus is invalid: which he easily foreseeing, hath joyned with the Jewish Rabbins in the second answer, admitting that Jehovah our righteousness is the name of the Messiah, but withall denying that the Christ is that Jehovah. To which purpose they assert those words, Jehovah our righteousness, to be delivered by way of proposition, not of apposition: and this they endeavour to prove by such places of Scripture as seem to infer as much. As Moses built an Altar, and called the name of it Jehovah Nissi, Exod. 17. 15. Gideon built an Altar unto the Lord, and called it Jehovah Shalom, Judg. 6. 24. And the name of the City in the last words of Ezekiel is Jehovah Shammah. In all which places it is most certain that the Jehovah is not predicated of that of whose name it is a part; but is the Subject of a Proposition, given by way of nomination, whose Verb substantive or copula is understood. But from thence to conclude, that the Lord our righteousness can be no otherwise understood of Christ then as a Proposition, and that we by calling him so, according to the Prophet's prediction, can understand no more thereby then that God the Father of Christ doth justify us, is most irrational. For first, it is therefore necessary to interpret those names by way of a Proposition of themselves, because Jehovah cannot be the Predicate of that which is named; it being most apparent that an Altar or a City built cannot be God: and whatsoever is not Jehovah without addition, cannot be Jehovah with addition. But there is no incongruity in attributing of that name to Christ, to whom we have already proved it actually given: and our Adversaries, who teach that the name Jehovah is sometimes given to the Angels representing God, must acknowledge that it may be given unto Christ, whom they confess to be above all Angels, and far more fully and exactly to represent the Father. Secondly, that which is the addition in those names cannot be truly predicated of that thing which bears the name. Moses could not say that Altar was his Exaltation, nor Gideon that it was his Peace. And if it could not so be predicated by it self, it could neither be by apposition, and consequently, even in this respect it was necessary to make the name a Proposition. But our Righteousness may undoubtedly be predicated of him who is here called by the name of the Lord our righteousness; for the Apostle hath expressly taught us that he is made righteousness unto us, 1 Cor. 1. 30. And if it may be in it self, there can be no repugnancy in its predication by way of apposition. Thirdly, that addition of our righteousness doth not only truly belong to Christ, but in some manner properly and peculiarly, so as in that notion it can belong to no other person called Jehovah but to that Christ alone. For he alone is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth, Rom. 10. 4. and when he is said to be made unto us righteousness, 1 Cor. 1. 30. he is thereby distinguished from God the Father. Being then Christ is thus peculiarly called our Righteousness under the Gospel, being the place of the Prophet forementioned speaketh of this as a name to be used under the Gospel, being no other person called Jehovah is ever expressly called our righteousness in the Gospel; it followeth not only that Christ may be so called, but that the prophecy cannot otherwise be fulfilled, then by acknowledging that Christ is the Lord our righteousness: and consequently that is his name, not by way of proposition, but of apposition and appropriation; so that being both Jehovah and our righteousness, he is as truly Jehovah as our righteousness. f. Jer. 23. 5, 6. Zach. 3. 10, 11.

And as the original Jehovah was spoken of Christ by the holy Prophets; so the title of Lord, as the usual interpretation of that name, was attributed unto him by the Apostles. In that signal prediction of the first Age of the Gospel God promised by Joel, that whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord Joel 2. 32. (Jehovah) shall be delivered: and S. Paul hath assured us that Christ is that Lord, by proving from thence, that whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed, and inferring from that, if we confess with our mouth the Lord Jesus, we shall be saved. For if it be a certain truth, that whosoever confesseth the Lord Jesus shall be saved; and the certainty of this truth depend upon that foundation, that whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed; and the certainty of that in relation to Christ depend upon that other promise, Whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved: then must the Lord in the thirteenth verse of the tenth Chapter to the Romans be the same with the Lord Jesus in the ninth verse; or else S. Paul's Argument must be invalid and fallacious, as containing that in the Conclusion which was not comprehended in the Premises. But the Lord in the ninth verse is no other then Jehovah, as appeareth by the Prophet Joel from whom that Scripture is taken. Therefore our Saviour in the New Testament is called Lord, as that name or title is the interpretation of Jehovah.

If we consider the Office of John the Baptist peculiar unto him, we know it was he of whom it is written in the Prophet Malachi, I will send my messenger, Mal. 11. 10.

and he shall prepare the way before me : we are sure he which spake those words was (Jehovah) the Lord of hosts; and we are as sure that Christ is that Lord before whose face John the Baptist prepared the way. The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, saith Isaiah, Prepare ye the way of the Lord (Jehovah :) and this is he that was spoken of by the Prophet Isaiah, saith S. Matthew : this is he of whom his father Zachariah did divinely preface, Thou child shalt be called the Prophet of the Highest, for thou shalt go before the face of the Lord to prepare his ways. Where Christ is certainly the Lord, and the Lord * undeniably Jehovah.

* I say therefore undeniably, because it is not only the

undoubted translation of the name יהוה in the Prophet, (which of itself were sufficient;) but also is delivered in that manner which is (though unreasonably) required to signify the proper name of God, $\alpha\epsilon\tau\epsilon\rho\omega\delta\omega\upsilon\sigma\alpha\ \kappa\upsilon\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, not $\tau\omicron\ \kappa\upsilon\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, that is, without, not with, an Article. For now our Saviour's Deity must be tried by a new kind of School-Divinity, and the most fundamental Doctrine, maintained as such ever since the Apostles times by the whole Catholic Church, must be examined, censured and condemned, by δ , η , $\tau\epsilon$. Socinus first makes use of this observation against Nicius; and after him Crellins hath laid it as a grave and serious foundation, and spread it out into its several corners, to uphold the fabrick of his superstructions. First, Vox Jehovah magis quam cetera Dei nomina propriorum naturam sequitur; ideo etiam Græca $\kappa\upsilon\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, cum pro illa ponitur, proprium indolem, qua licet, amulatur. Secondly, Propriis nominibus articulus libentius subtrahitur, licet cum etiam sæpe concommittitur potius quam necessitatis causa admittant. Idem fit in voce $\kappa\upsilon\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ cum pro Jehovah ponitur. Thirdly, Hæc est causa cur in novo Testamento, maxime apud Lucam & Paulum, vox $\kappa\upsilon\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, cum Deum summum designat, articulo libentius careat; at cum de Christo subjective usurpatur, raro articulus omittitur. What strange uncertainties are these to build the denial of so important an Article as Christ's Divinity upon? He does not say absolutely Jehovah is the proper name of God, but only that it doth more follow the nature of proper names, than the other names of God. And indeed it is certain that sometimes it hath the nature of an appellative, as Deut. 6. 4. יהוה אחד יהוה אחד, the Lord our God is one Lord: and yet if it be not always and absolutely a proper name, though all the rest were granted to be true, the Argument must be of no validity. Again, he cannot say an Article is never affixed to a proper name, but only that libentius subtrahitur, it is rather omitted than affixed: which yet is far from a certain or a true rule, especially in the language of the New Testament. For no man can deny Jesus to be the proper name of Christ, given him according to the Law at his Circumcision, יהושע יהושע , Luke 2. 21. and yet whosoever shall read the Gospel of S. Matthew, will find it ten times δ Ιησους , with an Article, for once Ιησους , without it. And in the Acts of the Apostles, written in a more Attick style, S. Paul is oftner styled δ Παυλος than simply Παυλος . So Balaam, Gallio, &c. Some persons we find in the New Testament, whom, if we should stay till we found them without an Article, we should never call by their names at all; as Appelles, Balak, &c. Thirdly, δ Κυριος is so often used for that God who is the Father with an Article, and Κυριος for the Son without an Article, (For the Father, Matt. 1. 22. 2. 15. 5. 33. 22. 44. Mark 12. 36. Luke 1. 6, 9, 15, 46. 2. 15, 22, 23. 10. 1. Acts 2. 35, 34. 3. 19. 17. 27. Rom. 15. 11. 1 Cor. 10. 16. 16. 7. 2 Cor. 5. 11. Eph. 5. 17, 19. Col. 3. 16, 20, 23. 2 Thess. 3. 3. 2 Tim. 1. 16. Heb. 8. 2, 11. 12. 14. Jam. 4. 10, 15. 1 Pet. 2. 3. For the Son, Matth. 3. 3. 22. 43, 45. Mark 1. 3. Luke 1. 76. 2. 11. 3. 4. 20. 44. Joh. 1. 23. Acts 2. 36. 10. 36. 11. 16, 21. 15. 11. Rom. 1. 7. 10. 9, 12. 14. 6, 8, 14. 16. 2, 8, 11, 12, 13, 22. 1 Cor. 1. 3. 4. 17. 7. 22, 23, 39. 9. 1, 2. 10. 21. 11. 11. 12. 3. 14. 37. 15. 58. 16. 10, 19. 2 Cor. 1. 2. 2. 12. 4. 5. 10. 17. 11. 17. 12. 1. Gal. 1. 3. 5. 10. Eph. 1. 2. 2. 21. 4. 1, 5, 17. 5. 8. 6. 4, 10, 21, 23. Phil. 1. 2, 14. 2. 11, 19, 24, 29. 3. 1, 20. 4. 1, 2, 10. Col. 1. 3. 3. 17, 18, 24. 4. 7, 17. 1 Thess. 1. 1. 3. 8. 4. 1, 15, 17. 5. 2, 12. 2 Thess. 1. 1, 2. 2. 13. 3. 4. 1 Tim. 1. 1. 2 Tim. 2. 24. Tit. 1. 4. Philem. 3, 16, 20. Jam. 1. 1. 2 Pet. 3. 8, 10. 2 Joh. 3. Jud. 14. Rev. 14. 13. 19. 16. I say, they are thus so often used) that though they equal not the number of their contrary acceptations, yet they come so near, as to yield no ground for any such observation, as if the Holy Ghost intended any such Article-distinction. Nay, it is most evident that the sacred Pen-men intended no such distinction, because in the same place speaking of the same person, they usually observe the indifference of adding or omitting the Article. As Jam. 5. 11. $\text{Τὸν κομμουνῶντος ἡμῶν ἰσοκράτους, καὶ πᾶτος Κυρίου ἡμῶν, ἐν πολυπληθείᾳ ἡμεῶν ὁ Κύριος καὶ ἡμεῖς ἡμεῖς}$ 2 Tim. 1. 18. $\text{Δὲν αὐτὸν ὁ Κύριος εὐχρίστῳ πνεύματι Κυρίου ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ}$ 1 Cor. 7. 17. $\text{Ἐστὶν ὁ κύριος καὶ ὁ κύριος, ὅτι ἐκείνῳ}$ 22. $\text{Ὁ δὲ ἐν Κυρίῳ κληθεὶς δόξα, ἀπὸ δόξης Κυρίου ἐστὶ}$. See Rom. 14. 6, 7, 8. It therefore being Jehovah is not affirmed absolutely to be a proper name; being, if it were, yet it appears that it is not the custom of the New Testament to use every proper name oftner without an Article than with one; being δ Κυριος is so often taken for him whom they acknowledge God, and Κυριος for him whom they cannot deny to be the Christ: it followeth that Christ, acknowledged to be the Lord, cannot by any virtue of an Article be denied to be the true Jehovah. We must not then think to decide this controversy by the Articles, of which the sacred Pen-men were not curious, and the Transcribers have been very careless: nor is there so great uncertainty of the ancient MSS. in any thing as in the words and Articles of Κυριος and Θεός . The Vulgar Edition, Rev. 1. 8. hath $\text{λέγει ὁ Κύριος ὁ Θεός}$, the Complutensis $\text{λέγει Κύριος ὁ Θεός}$, Plantine $\text{λέγει ὁ Κύριος ὁ Θεός}$: against the Socinian Rule, who will have an accession by δ to Θεός , and a diminution by δ from Κυριος . As Rev. 4. 11. $\text{Ἀξίος ἔσθι, κύριος, λατρεῖν καὶ δοῦναι}$ in other MSS. $\text{Ἀξίος ἔσθι, ὁ Κύριος καὶ ὁ Θεός ἡμῶν ὁ ἀγιος, λατρεῖν καὶ δοῦναι}$. 1 Cor. 11. 27. $\text{πᾶς ποτιζόμενος τὸν Κυρίον ἀναξίως καὶ Κυρίῳ}$ 1 Cor. 14. 37. the Vulg. Edit. $\text{ἐπὶ καὶ Κυρίῳ εἰς ἐξουσίαν}$ the Complut. ἐπὶ Κυρίῳ . So where we usually read Χριστός , divers ancient MSS. have Κύριος . Lastly, it is observable that even in these words of the Creed, which we now expound, Κύριος is spoken expressly of Christ without an Article; for so we read it, $\text{Καὶ εἰς Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενοῦν Κύριον ἡμῶν}$.

Psal. 110. 1.

† Chald. Pa-
raph.

Malac. 3. 1.

יהוה

Nor is this the only Notation of the Name or Title Lord taken in a sense divine, above the expression of all mere humane power and dominion; for as it is often used as the interpretation of the name Jehovah, so is it also for that of Adon or Adonai. The Lord said unto my Lord, saith David, that is, in the Original, Jehovah unto Adon; and that Adon is the † Word, that Lord is Christ. We know the Temple at Jerusalem was the Temple of the most High God, and the Lord of that Temple in the emphasis of an Hebrew Article was Christ, as appeareth by that Prophet; The Lord whom ye seek shall suddenly come to his Temple, even the messenger of the Covenant, whom ye delight in.

Now

Now this Notation, as it is the interpretation of *Adon*, signifieth immediately and properly *dominion* implying a right of possession, and power of disposing. Which doth not onely agree with that other notion of *Jehovah*, but presupposes it, as following and flowing from it. For he who alone hath a being or existence of himself, and thereby is the fountain of all things beside himself, must be acknowledged to have full power and dominion over all: because every thing must necessarily belong to him from whom it hath received what it is. Wherefore being *Christ* is the *Lord*, as that title is taken for *Jehovah*, the name of God, expressing the necessary existence and independence of his single being, and consequently the dependency of all others upon him; it followeth that he be acknowledged also the *Lord*, as that name expresseth *Adon*, signifying power authoritative and proper dominion. Thus having explained the Notation of the word *Lord*, which we propounded as the first part of our exposition; we come next to the second, which is, to declare the nature of this Dominion, and to shew how and in what respect *Christ* is the *Lord*.

Now for the full and exact understanding of the Dominion seated or invested in *Christ* as the *Lord*, it will be necessary to distinguish it according to that diversity which the Scriptures represent unto us. As therefore we have observed two Natures united in his Person, so must we also consider two kinds of Dominion belonging respectively to those natures; one inherent in his Divinity, the other bestowed upon his Humanity; one as he is the *Lord* the maker of all things, the other as he is made *Lord* of all things.

For the First, we are assured that the *Word was God*, that by the same Word *John 1.1.3.* *all things were made, and without him was not any thing made that was made*; we must acknowledge, that whosoever is the Creatour of all things must have a direct Dominion over all, as belonging to the possession of the Creatour who made all things. Therefore the *Word*, that is, *Christ* as God, hath the supreme and universal Dominion of the world. Which was well expressed by that famous confession of no longer doubting, but believing, *Thomas, My Lord John 20.28.* *and my God.*

For the Second, it is also certain that there was some kind of Lordship given or bestowed on *Christ*, whose very Unction proves no less then an imparted Dominion; as *S. Peter* tells us that he was *made both Lord and Christ.* What *Acts 2. 36.* *David* spake of man, the Apostle hath applied peculiarly unto him, *Thou Heb. 2. 7, 8.* *crownedst him with glory and honour, and didst set him over the works of thy hands: Thou hast put all things in subjection under his feet.*

Now a Dominion thus imparted, given, derived or bestowed, cannot be that which belongeth unto God as God, founded in the Divine nature, because whatsoever is such is absolute and independent. Wherefore this Lordship thus imparted or acquired appertaineth to the humane nature, and belongeth to our Saviour as the Son of man. The right of Judicature is part of this Power; and *Christ* himself hath told us, that the Father *hath given him John 5. 27.* *authority to execute judgment, because he is the Son of man*: and by virtue of this delegated authority, the *Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father Matt. 16. 27.* *with his Angels, and reward every man according to his works.* Part of the same Dominion is the power of forgiving sins; as pardoning, no less then punishing, is a branch of the supreme Magistracy: and *Christ* did therefore say to the sick of the palsey, *thy sins be forgiven thee, that we might know that the Matt. 9. 2, 6.* *Son of man had power on earth to forgive sins.* Another branch of that Power is the alteration of the Law, there being the same authority required to abrogate or alter which is to make a law: and *Christ* asserted himself to be *greater Matt. 12. 6, 8.* *then the Temple*, shewing that *the Son of man was Lord even of the Sabbath-day.*

This

This Dominion thus given unto *Christ* in his humane nature was a direct and plenary power over all things, but was not actually given him at once, but part while he lived on earth, part after his death and resurrection. For though it be true *that Jesus knew*, before his death, *that the Father had given all things into his hands*; yet it is observable that in the same place it is written that he likewise knew *that he was come from God, and went to God*: and part of that power he received when he came from God, with part he was invested when he went to God; the first to enable him, the second, not onely so, but also to reward him. For to this end *Christ both died, rose, and revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and living*. After his resurrection he said to the Disciples, *All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth*. He drunk of the brook in the way, therefore he hath lift up his head. Because he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross: Therefore God hath also highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name; That at the name of *Jesus* every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; And that every tongue should confess that *Jesus Christ is Lord*, to the glory of God the Father. Thus for and after his death he was instated in a full power and dominion over all things, even as the Son of man, but exalted by the Father, who raised him from the dead, and set him at his right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principallitie, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not onely in this world, but also in that which is to come; And hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be head over all things to the Church.

Now as all the power given unto *Christ* as man had not the same beginning in respect of the use or possession, so neither, when begun, shall it all have the same duration. For part of it being merely Oeconomicall, aiming at a certain end, shall then cease and determinate when that end for which 'twas given shall be accomplished: part, being either due upon the union of the humane nature with the Divine, or upon covenant, as a reward for the Sufferings endured in that nature, must be coeval with that union and that nature which so suffered, and consequently must be eternall.

Of the first part of this Dominion did *David* speak, when by the spirit of Prophecie he called his Son his Lord; *The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand, untill I make thine enemies thy foot-stool*: where the continuation of *Christ's* Dominion over his enemies is promised to be prolonged untill their final and total subjection. For he must reign till he hath put all things under his feet. And as we are sure of the continuation of that Kingdom till that time, so are we assured of the resignation at that time. For when he shall have put down all rule, and all authority and power, then shall he deliver up the kingdom to God, even the Father. And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all. Thus he which was appointed to rule in the midst of his enemies during their rebellion, shall resign up his Commission after their subjection.

But we must not look upon *Christ* onely in the nature of a General, who hath received a Commission, or of an Ambassadour, with perfect Instructions; but of the onely Son of God, impowered and employed to destroy the enemies of his Father's Kingdom: and though thus impowered and commissioned, though resigning that authority which hath already had its perfect work, yet still the onely Son, and the heir of all things in his Father's house, never to relinquish his dominion over those whom he hath purchased with his own blood, never to be deprived of that reward which was assigned him for his Sufferings: for if the prize which we expect in the race of our imperfect obedience

dience be an immaculable crown, if the weight of glory which we look for from him be eternall; then cannot his perfect and absolute Obedience be crowned with a fading power, or he cease ruling over us, who hath always reigned in us. We shall for ever reign with him, and he will make us priests and kings; but so that he continue still for ever High Priest, and King of Kings.

The certainty of this eternall Dominion of *Christ* as Man we may well ground upon the promise made to *David*, because by reason of that promise *Christ* himself is called *David*. For so God speaketh concerning his people; *I will set up one shepherd over them, and he shall feed them, even my servant David; he shall feed them, and he shall be their shepherd. And I the Lord will be their God, and my servant David a Prince among them. I the Lord have spoken it.* ^{Exk. 34. 23, 24.} Now the promise was thus made expressly to *David*, *Thy house and thy kingdom shall be established for ever before thee, thy throne shall be established for ever.* ^{2 Sam. 7. 16.} And although that term *for ever* in the Hebrew language may signifie עולם עולם oft-times no more then a certain duration so long as the nature of the thing is durable, or at the utmost but to the end of all things; and so the Oeconomical Dominion or Kingdom of *Christ* may be thought sufficiently to fulfill that promise, because it shall certainly continue so long as the nature of that Oeconomy requireth, till all things be performed for which *Christ* was sent, and that continuation will infallibly extend unto the end of all things: yet sometimes also the same term *for ever* signifieth that absolute eternity of future duration which shall have no end at all: and that it is so far to be extended particularly in that promise made to *David*, and to be fulfilled in his Son, is as certain as the Promise. For the Angel *Gabriel* did give that clear exposition to the blessed Virgin, when in this manner he foretold the glory of him who was then to be conceived in her womb; *The Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David: And he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever, and of his kingdom there shall be no end.* ^{Luk. 1. 32, 33.} Nor is this clearer in *Gabriel's* explication of the promise, then in *Daniel's* prevision of the performance; who *saw in the night-visions, and behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven; and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion and glory, and a kingdom, that all people and languages should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed.* ^{Dan. 7. 13, 14.}

Thus *Christ* is Lord both by a natural and independent Dominion: as God, the Creatour, and consequently the owner, of the works of his hands; and by a derived, imparted and dependent right, as man, sent, anointed, raised and exalted, and so made Lord and *Christ*: which authority so given and bestowed upon him is partly Oeconomical, and therefore to be resigned into the hands of the Father, when all those ends for which it was imparted are accomplished; partly so proper to the union, or due unto the passion, of the humane nature, that it must be coeval with it, that is, of eternall duration.

The third part of our Explication is, the due consideration of the Object of *Christ's* Dominion, enquiring whose Lord he is, and how *ours*. To which purpose first observe the latitude, extent, or rather universality, of his Power, under which all things are comprehended, as subjected to it. For *he is Lord of all*, saith *S. Peter*, of all things, and of all persons; and he must be so, who made all things as God, and to whom all power is given as man. To him then all things are subjected whose subjection implieth not a contradiction. For *he hath put all things under his feet: but when he saith all things are put under him, it is manifest that he is excepted which did put all things under him.* ^{1 Cor. 15. 27.} God onely then excepted, whose original Dominion is repugnant to the least sub-

Heb. 1. 6.
Psalm 8.

jection, all things are subject unto *Christ*, whether they be things in Heaven, or things on earth. In Heaven he is far above all principalities and powers, and all the Angels of God worship him; on earth all nations are his inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth are his possession. Thus *Christ* is certainly our Lord, because he is the Lord of all; and when all things were subjected to him, we were not excepted.

But in the midst of this Universality of *Christ's* Regal Authority, it will be farther necessary to find some propriety of Dominion, by which he may be said to be peculiarly our Lord. 'Tis true, he made us, and not we our selves, we are the work of his hands; but the lowest of his Creatures can speak as much. We are still preserved by his power, and as he made us, so doth he maintain us; but at the same time he feedeth the ravens, and cloatheth the lilies of the field. Wherefore beside his original right of Creation, and his continued right of Preservation, we shall find a more peculiar right of Redemption, belonging properly to the sons of men. And in this Redemption, though a single word, we shall find a † double title to a most just Dominion, one of Conquest, another of Purchase.

† For the right understanding of this double title involved

in the word *Redemption*, it will be necessary to take notice of the ways by which Humane Dominion is acquired, and Servitude introduced. *Servi aut nascuntur, aut fiunt*, saith the Civilian, *Inst. l. i. tit. 3.* but in Theology we say more, *Servi & nascuntur, & fiunt.* Man is born the servant of God his Maker, man is made the servant of his Redeemer. Two ways in general they observed, by which they came to serve who were not born Slaves. *Fiunt aut jure gentium, id est, captivitate; aut jure civili, cum liber homo major viginti annis ad pretium participandum sese venundari passus est.* Two ways then also there were by which Dominion over these servants was acquired, by Conquest or by Purchase, and both these were always accounted just. *Dionysius Halicarnassensis*, an excellent Historian, a curious observer of the Roman Customs, and an exact judge of their actions, citing a *Græcian*, justifieth the right which the Masters in Rome claimed over their servants upon these two grounds. *Εὐρύχαλον δὲ τοῖς Παιδαίοις αἱ εἰς Στεγνόντων κλίσιν καὶ τὸ διὰ τοῦτο τὸν δούλον τὸν ἐξ ἑσθῆς. ἢ δὲ ἀντιπρόσωπον παρὰ τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ ἐνὸς θεοῦ πολλοὺς ἐν τῇ λαοφύῳ, ἢ τὴν ἐργασίαν Κυριότητος. ὅτι αὐτὰς ἀλλὰ οὐδὲν ἔχουσιν τοῖς λαοφύῳ ἔχειν, ἢ ἀντιπρόσωπον παρὰ ἑσθῆς, καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν τὸν ἐξ ἑσθῆς κλίσιν τοῦ δούλου ἐκείνου τοῦ δούλου. Hist. l. 4.* where it is also farther to be observed, that the same persons were made slaves by conquest, and possessed by purchase; by conquest to the City of Rome, by purchase to the Roman Citizen. The General first took and saved them, and so made them his, that is, reduced them to the will and power of the State from which he received his Commission, and in whose name and for whose interest he fought: This State exposed their interest to sale, and so what-ever right had been gained by the conquering sword was devolved on the Roman Citizen for a certain summe of money paid to the State to defray the charges of that war. Thus every Lord or Master of a slave so taken had full power over him, and possession of him, by right of purchase, unto which he was first made liable by conquest. And though not exactly in that manner, yet by that double right, is *Christ* become our Lord, and we his servants.

Rom. 6. 16.
Heb. 2. 14.
Col. 2. 15.

We were first servants of the enemy of God; for him we obeyed, and his servants we are whom we obey: when *Christ* through death destroyed him that had the power of death, that is, the Devil, and delivered us; He spoiled principalities and powers, and made a shew of them openly, triumphing over them. But, contrary to the custome of triumphing Conquerours, he did not sell, but buy us; because while he saved us, he died for us, and that death was the price by which he purchased us; even so this dying Victor gave us life: upon the Cross, as his triumphant chariot, he shed that precious blood which bought us, and thereby became our Lord by right of Redemption, both as to Conquest and to Purchase.

Acts 3. 15.
1 Cor. 2. 8.
2 Thess. 2. 14.

Beside, he hath not onely bought us, but provideth for us; what-ever we have, we receive from him as the Master of the family; we hold of him all temporal and eternall blessings, which we enjoy in this, or hope for in another life. He is the Prince of life, and by him we live; he is the Lord of glory, and we are called by his Gospel to the obtaining of the glory of our Lord. Wherefore he hath us under his dominion, and becomes our Lord by right of Promotion.

Rom. 6. 6, 13,
19.

Lastly, men were not anciently sold always by others, but sometimes by themselves; and whosoever of us truly believe in *Christ*, have given up our names unto him. In our Baptismal vow we bind our selves unto his service, that henceforth we will not serve sin; but yield our selves unto God, as those that are alive from the dead, and our members

as

as instruments of righteousness unto God: that, as we have yielded our members servants to uncleanness and to iniquity; even so we should yield our members servants to righteousness, unto holiness. And thus the same Dominion is acknowledged by Compact, and confirmed by Covenant; and so Christ becomes our Lord by right of Obligation.

The necessity of believing and professing our Faith in this part of the Article appeareth, first, in the discovery of our condition; for by this we know that we are not our own, neither our persons, nor our actions. ^{1 Cor. 6. 19,} Know ye not, saith S. Paul, that ye are not your own? for ye are bought with a price. And ancient Servitude, to which the Scriptures relate, put the servants wholly in the * possession of their Master; so that their persons were as properly his as the rest of his goods. And if we be so in respect of Christ, then may we not live to our selves, but to him; for in this the difference of † service and freedom doth properly consist: we cannot do our own wills, but the will of him whose we are. Christ took upon him the form of a servant: and to give us a proper and perfect example of that condition, he telleth us, ^a I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me. First therefore we must conclude with the Apostle, reflecting upon Christ's Dominion and our Obligation, that ^b none of us liveth to himself, and no man dieth to himself. For whether we live, we live unto the Lord; or whether we die, we die unto the Lord: whether we live therefore, or die, we are the Lord's.

^{δούλος ἀνθρώπου.} Idem Eth. l. 8. c. 9. And again more expressly, ^{τίς μὲν ἔν η̄ εὐσις τοῦ δούλου, καὶ τίς ἡ δουλεία, ἐκ τούτων δηλον.} ^{οὐδ' αὖτ' αὐτὰ φύσει, ἀλλ' ἄλλου ἀνθρώπου ἢ, ὅτι εὐσις δούλος ὄντιν' ἄλλου δ' ὄντιν' ἀνθρώπου, δε ἀν κλίμα ἢ, ἀνθρώπου ὄν.} So that the definition of a servant according to Aristotle is, he, who being a man, is notwithstanding the possession of a man. And although all Relatives be predicated of each other in oblique, as pater est filii pater, & filius patris filius; dominus est servi dominus, & servus domini servus: yet he observes a difference in this, that a servant is not only servus domini, but simply domini, but the master is not simply servi, but dominus servi. ^{Ὁ μὲν δεσπότης τοῦ δούλου δεσπότης μόνον, ἐκείνου ἢ ἑκ ἑσιν· ὁ δ' ὁ δούλος ἢ μόνον δεσπότης δούλος ὄντιν, ἀλλ' ἄλλου δούλος ἐκείνου.} The servant then is so wholly in the possession and for the use of his master, that he is nothing else but a living tool or instrument; inasmuch, says he, that if all tools were like those of Dedalus, or the Tripods of Vulcan, which the Poets feigned to move of themselves, Artificers would need no under-workmen, nor masters servants. ^{† So Arist. Ethic. 4. περὶ ἄλλον ζῆν δουλικόν.} and in the first of his Rhetoricks on the contrary, ^{ἐλδοῦναι τὸ μὴ περὶ ἄλλον ζῆν.} ^{¶ Τὸ ζῆν οὐ βέλτατον περὶ, ἢ ἐλδοῦναι ἔργον ἑαυτοῦ τοῦ δούλου ὅλος, τὸ ζῆν μὴ ὡς βέλτατον.} ^{Arist. Pol. 6. 2. Quid est libertas? potestas vivendi ut velis. Cicero Parad. * Joh. 6. 38. * Rom. 14. 7, 8.}

Secondly, the same is necessary both to inforce and invite us to obedience; to inforce us, as he is the Lord, to invite us, as Christ the Lord. If we acknowledge our selves to be his servants, we must bring into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ. He which therefore died, and rose and revived, that he might become the Lord both of the dead and living, maketh not that death and resurrection efficacious to any but such as by their service acknowledge that Dominion which he purchased. He, though he were a Son, yet learned obedience by the things which he suffered; And being made perfect, he is become the Author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him. Thus the consideration of the power invested in him, and the necessity of the service due unto him, should force us to Obedience; while the consideration of him whom we are thus obliged to serve should allure and invite us. When God gave the Law with fire and thunder, the affrighted Israelites desired to receive it from Moses, and upon that receipt promised obedience. Go thou near, said they to him, and hear all that the Lord our God shall say; and speak thou unto us, and we will hear it and do it. If they interpreted it so great a favour to receive the Law by the hands of Moses; if they made so ready and chearfull a promise of exact obedience unto the Law so given; how should we be invited to the same promise, and a better performance, who have received the whole will of God revealed to us by the Son of Man, who are to give an account of our performance to the same Man set down at the right hand of the Father? He first took our nature to become our Brother, that with so near a relation he might be made our Lord. If then the Patriarchs

did chearfully live in the land of *Goshen* subject to the power and command of *Egypt*, because that power was in the hand of *Joseph* their exalted brother; shall not we with all readines of mind submit our selves to the Divine dominion now given to him who gave himself for us? Shall all the Angels worship him, and all the Arch-angels bow down before him? and shall not we be proud to joyn with them?

Thirdly, the belief of *Christ's* Dominion is necessary for the regulation of all power, authority and dominion on earth, both in respect of those which rule, and in relation to those that obey. From hence the most absolute Monarchs learn, that the people which they rule are not their own, but the Subjects of a greater Prince, by him committed to their charge. Upon this *S. Paul* doth ground his admonition to Masters, *Give unto your servants that which is just and equal, knowing that ye also have a Master in heaven.* God gave a power to the *Israelites* to make hired servants of their brethren, but not slaves; and gives this reason of the interdiction, *For they are my servants which I brought forth out of the land of Egypt; they shall not be sold as bondmen.* What tenderness then should be used towards those who are the servants of that Lord who redeemed them from a greater bondage, who bought them with a higher price? From hence those which are subject learn to obey the powers which are of humane ordination, because in them they obey the Lord of all. Subjects bear the same proportion, and stand in the same relation to their Governours, with servants to their Masters: and *S. Paul* hath given them this charge, *Obey in all things your masters according to the flesh; And whatsoever ye doe, doe it heartily, as to the Lord, and not unto men; Knowing that of the Lord ye shall receive the reward of the inheritance: for ye serve the Lord Christ.* Neither do we learn from hence onely whom, but also how, to obey. For while we look upon one Lord in Heaven, while we consider him as the Lord of Lords, we regulate our obedience to them by our service due to him, and so are always ready to obey, but in the Lord.

Lastly, this title of our Saviour is of necessary belief for our comfort and encouragement. For being Lord of all, he is able to dispose of all things for the benefit of those which serve him. He who commanded the unconstant winds, and stilled the raging seas, he who multiplied the loaves and fishes, and created wine with the word of his mouth, hath all creatures now under exact obedience; and therefore none can want whom he undertaketh to provide for. *For the same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon him.* Many are the enemies of those persons who dedicate themselves unto his service; but our enemies are his, and part of his dominion is therefore given him, and to continue in him untill all his enemies be made his footstool. Great is the power of the lusts of our flesh which war in our members; but his grace is sufficient for us, and the power of that spirit by which he ruleth in us. Heavy are the afflictions which we are called to undergoe for his sake: but if we suffer with him, we shall reign together with him: and blessed be that Dominion which makes us all Kings, that he may be for ever Lord of Lords and King of Kings.

After this Explication, every Christian may perceive what he is to believe in this part of the Article, and expresse himself how he would be understood, when he maketh this profession of his Faith, *I believe in Christ our Lord.* For thereby we may and ought to intend thus much; I do assent unto this as a certain and infallible truth, taught me by God himself, that *Jesus Christ*, the onely Son of God, is the true *Jehovah*, who hath that being which is originally and eternally of it self, and of which all other beings do essentially depend: That, by the right of emanation of all things from him, he hath an absolute,

solute, supreme and universal Dominion over all things, as God : That as the Son of man he is invested with all power in Heaven and earth ; partly Oeconomically, for the completing our Redemption, and the destruction of our enemies, to continue to the end of all things, and then to be resigned to the Father ; partly consequent unto the union, or due unto the obedience of his Passion, and so eternally, as belonging to that Kingdom which shall have no end. And though he be thus Lord of all things by right of the first creation and constant preservation of them, yet is he more peculiarly the Lord of us who by Faith are consecrated to his service : for through the work of our Redemption he becomes our Lord both by the right of Conquest and of Purchase ; and making us the Sons of God, and providing heavenly mansions for us, he acquires a farther right of Promotion, which, considering the Covenant we all make to serve him, is at last completed in the right of a voluntary obligation. And thus I believe in *Christ our Lord*.

ARTICLE III.

Which was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary.

THESE words, as they now stand, clearly distinguish the Conception of Jesus from his Nativity, attributing the first to the Holy Ghost, the second to the blessed Virgin : whereas the ancient Creeds made no such distinction, but, without any particular express mention of the Conception, had it onely in this manner, * *who was born by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary ; or, of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary ;* understanding by the word *born*, not onely the Nativity, but also the Conception and Generation. This is very necessary to be observed, because otherwise the addition of a word will prove the diminution of the sense of the Article. For they which speak onely of the operation of the Holy Ghost in *Christ's* Conception, and of the manner of his Birth, leave out most part of that which was anciently understood under that one term of being *born* of the Holy Ghost and of the Virgin Mary.

* Deum Jndæi sic prædicant solum, ut negent filium ejus ; negent simul cum eo unum esse qui natus est de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria Virgine. Novatianus. Qui natus est de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria Virgine. Rufinus in Symb. S.

That therefore nothing may be omitted which is pertinent to express the full intent and to comprehend the utmost signification of this Article, we shall consider three Persons mentioned, so far as they are concerned in it. The first is He who was conceived and born ; the second, He by whose energy or operation he was conceived ; the third, She who did conceive and bear him.

Aug. Ench. ad Laurent. c. 34, 37, & 38. Natus de Spiritu S. & Maria Virgine. as also the Council of Fræsfurd in Sacrosyllabo, S. Aug. de Fide & Symb. Natus est per Spiritum S. ex Virgine Maria. Nonne de Sp. S. & Virgine Maria Dei filius unicus natus est ? S. Aug. de Prædest. Sanct. c. 15. & paulo post, quia natus est de Sp. S. & Maria Virgine. S. Leo Epist. 10. c. 2. Maximus Taurin. Chrysol. Etherius uxam. Author Symbol. ad Catechum. Qui natus est de Spiritu S. ex Maria Virgine. So also Venantius Fortunatus. From whence Fulgentius de Fide ad Petrum Diaconum ; Natus de Spiritu S. ex Maria Virgine, in Symbolo acceptum, & corde ad justitiam credit, & ore ad salutem S. Ecclesia confitetur. Item prædicandum est quomodo Filius Dei incarnatus est de Sp. S. ex Maria semper-Virgine. Capitul. Caroli 82. And Alcuinus l. 3. de Trinit. c. 1. Dicitur in Symbolo Catholicæ fidei, quod Christus de Spiritu S. & ex Maria Virgine sit natus. In the ancient MS. transcribed by the learned Archbishop of Armagh, πῶς ἡ γενεὰ ἐκ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος καὶ τῆς παρθένου. So Paulus Samosatensis in his 5. Proposition ; Ἰν οὗτος ὁ ἡγεμὼν ἐκ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος καὶ τῆς παρθένου. These, omitted in the Nicene Creed, were put in by the Council of Constantinople, upon the occasion of the Apollinarian Heresy, as was observed by Diogenes Bishop of Cyzicum in the Council of Chalcedon ; Οἱ ἁγιοὶ πατέρες οἱ μὲν ταῦτα, οὐ ἱσαμένους, οὐκ ἔκρινον οἱ ἁγιοὶ ἐν Νίκαιᾳ πατέρες, ἐσαυμάτως εἰσέκοιτες, ἐκ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος καὶ τῆς παρθένου. In the several expositions among the Sermons de Tempore, falsely attributed to S. Aug. Qui conceptus est de Spiritu S. natus ex Virgine Maria. So Eusebius Gallicanus Homil. de Symbolo. And from thence it hath so continued, as we now read it, Which was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary.

For the first, the Relative in the front of this carries us clearly back unto the former Article, and tells us that he which was thus conceived and born

† Huic, quem
dudum de
Patre natum
ineffabiliter
didicisti,
nunc a Sp. S.
templem fa-
bricatum in-
tra secreta u-
teri Virgini-
ae intellige.
Ruff.

was *Jesus Christ*, the onely Son of God. And being we have already demon-
strated that this onely Son is therefore called so, because he was begotten by
the Father from all eternity, and so of the same substance with him; it fol-
loweth that this Article at the first beginning, or by virtue of its connexion,
can import no less then this most certain, but miraculous, truth, that † He
which was begotten by the Father before all worlds, was now in the fulness of
time *conceived by the Holy Ghost, and born of the Virgin Mary*. Again, being by the
Conception and Birth is to be understood whatsoever was done toward the
production of the humane nature of our Saviour; therefore the same Relative
considered with the words which follow it can speak no less then the Incarna-
tion of that Person. And thus even in the entry of the Article we meet with
the Incarnation of the Son of God; that great mystery wrapt up in that short
sentence of S. *John*, *The word was made flesh*.

Indeed the Pronoun hath relation not onely unto this but to the following
Articles, which have their necessary connexion with and foundation in this
Third: for He who was *conceived and born*, and so made man, did in that hu-
mane nature suffer, die, and rise again. Now when we say this was the
Word, and that Word was God, being whosoever is God cannot cease to be
so; it must necessarily follow, that he was made man by joyning the humane
nature with the Divine. But then we must take heed lest we conceive, be-
cause the Divine nature belongeth to the Father, to which the humane is con-
joyned, that therefore the Father should be incarnate, or *conceived and born*.
For as certainly as the Son was crucified, and the Son alone; so certainly the
same Son was incarnate, and that Son alone. Although the humane nature
was conjoyned with the Divinity, which is the nature common to the Father
and the Son; yet was that union made onely in the person of the Son. Which
Doctrine is to be observed against the Heresie of the * *Patripassians*, which
was both very ancient and far diffused, making the Father to be incarnate,
and becoming man to be crucified. But this very Creed was † always thought
to be a sufficient confutation of that fond Opinion, in that the Incarnation is
not subjoyned to the first, but to the second, Article; we do not say, *I believe
in God the Father Almighty, which was conceived, but, in his onely Son, our Lord,
which was conceived by the Holy Ghost*.

* The Heresie
of the Patri-
passians seems
onely to have
relation to the
suffering of
our Saviour,
because the
word signifies
no more then

the Passion of the Father. But it is founded in an error concerning the Incarnation, it being out of question, that he which was made
man did suffer. Epiphanius observes, Noctus was the first which taught this Heresie, who lived 130 years before him, more or less, and
when he was questioned for it he denied it: *ὁ δὲ τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐξέτασεν ταυτὶ τὸ μυστήριον*. But certainly this Heresie was
ancienter then Noctus; for the Patripassians are named by S. Cyprian, Epist. 73. and Tertullian his Master chargeeth it upon Praxeas: Duo
negotia Diaboli Praxeas Romæ procuravit, Prophetiam expulit, & Hæresim intulit; Paracletum fugavit, & Patrem crucifixit.
Adv. Prax. c. 1. And expressing the absurdity of that opinion; Itaque post tempus Pater natus & Pater passus, ipse Deus Dominus
Omnipotens Jesus Christus prædicatur. c. 2. And De Præsc. adv. Hæret. Post hos omnes etiam Praxeas quidam Hæresim intro-
duxit, quam Victorinus corroborare curavit. Hic Deum Patrem omnipotentem Jesum Christum esse dicit, hunc crucifixum pas-
sumque contendit; mortuum præterea seipsum sibi federe ad dextram suam, cum profana & sacrilega temeritate preponit. c. 52.
After Praxeas Noctus taught the same. *Ἐτάλαντο λέγοντες τὴν πατέρα πεπνυμέναι*, says Epiphanius: and being questioned for it, he
answered, *τί γὰρ κεν πεπνυμένα; ἔνα διὸν δοξάζω, ἔνα ὁπίσσω, καὶ ἕκ ἄλλον πάλιν αὐτὸ ὁμιλοῦντα, πεπνυμένα, ὁποδαῖοντα*. He
thought the Father and the Son to be the same Person, and therefore if the Son, the Father to be incarnate. *Ἵτιονότορα τὴν Χριστὸν ἐδί-
δαξεν, τὴν αὐτὴν ἰδὴ πατέρα καὶ υἱὸν καὶ ἄλλον πνεῦμα*. Epiph. Anaceph. After the Noctians followed the Sabellians. So Philastrius:
Sabellius Discipulus ejus, qui similitudinem sui Doctoris itidem secutus est, unde & Sabelliani postea sunt appellati, qui & Pa-
tripassiani, & Praxeani à Præxæ, & Hermogeniani ab Hermogene, qui fuerunt in Africa, qui & ista sententias abjecti sunt ab Ec-
clesia Catholica. So S. Aug. Sabelliani dicti sunt quidam Hæretici, qui vocantur & Patripassiani, qui dicunt ipsum Patrem pas-
sum esse. Tract. 36. in Job. This I confess is denied by Epiphanius, who acknowledges Sabellius to have followed Noctus in many things,
but not in the Incarnation or Passion of the Father. *Σαβελλιανοὶ οἱ τὰ ὁμοία ἀνοήτως (i. ἀνοήτως, id est, Nonnarois, vel ἀνοήτως,
id est, Nonnarois, as S. Aug. Novato) δοξάζοντες, παρὰ τὸ πρὸς μόνον * λέγοντες γὰρ μὴ πεπνυμέναι τὸν πατέρα*. This S. Augustine won-
ders very much at in Epiphanius: Sabelliani, inquit, similia Nocto dogmatizantes, præter hoc quod dicunt Patrem non esse pas-
sum; quomodo de Sabellianis intelligi potest, cum sic innouerint dicere Patrem passum, ut Patripassiani quam Sabelliani ex-
pitis nuncupentur? Aug. Hæc. 41. Indeed the Latine Fathers generally call the Sabellians Patripassians; and not onely so, but Theo-
doret doth so describe them as professing one Person, *ἐν μὲν τῇ πύλαι, ὡς πατέρας νομίζοντες, ἐν γὰρ τῇ καυῇ, ὡς υἱὸν ἐκασθεντοῦσα*.
l. 2. c. 9. After the Sabellians succeeded in the same Heresie the Priscillianists, as appeareth by Pope Leo, who sheweth they taught but one
person of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost: Quod blasphemæ genus de Sabellii opinione sumperunt, cujus discipuli etiam Patri-
passiani merito nuncupantur; quia si ipse est Filius qui & Pater, crux Filii patris est passio, & quicquid in forma servi Filius Pa-
tri obediendo sustinuit, totum in se Pater ipse suscepit. Ep. 93. c. 1. Thus the Patripassian Heresie, beginning from Praxeas and Her-
mogenes.

shut, should raise an opinion that his body was not true and proper flesh; he confirmed first his own Disciples, *Feel and see, that a spirit bath not flesh and bones, as you see me to have.* As therefore we believe the coming of *Christ*, so must we confess him to have come in the verity of our humane nature, even in true and proper flesh. With this determinate expression was it always necessary to acknowledge him: *For every spirit that confesseth Jesus Christ come in the flesh, is of God; and every spirit that confesseth not Jesus Christ come in the flesh, is not of God.* This spirit appeared early in opposition to the Apostolical doctrine; and *Christ*, who is both God and Man, was as soon denied to be Man as God. † *Simon Magus*, the Arch-heretick, first began, and many after followed him.

† *Simon Magus* first made himself to be *Christ*; and

what he feigned of himself, that was attributed by others unto *Christ*. *Dixerat se in monte Sina Legem Moysi in Patris persona dedisse Judæis, tempore Tiberii in Filii persona putative apparuisse. S. Aug. So S. Cyril represents him, ἐκ ἐν σαρκὶ, ἀλλὰ σαρκί, ὡς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦ γένεσθαι. Catech. 6. From this denials of his invention arise the Heresie of the Δοκνταί. For Saturninus, or Saturninus, followed his disciple Demader with his putative tantum hominem, as Irenæus; and in phantasmare tantum venisse, as Tertullian speaks. After him Valentius and his followers, Epiphanius, Isidorus and Secundus: then the Marcionians, Heraclonites and Ophites, Cerdon, Marcion, Lucanus, and generally the Manichees. These were the Δοκνταί or Φαρμακιστῆς, all conspiring in this, that *Christ* was not really what he appeared, nor did truly suffer what he seemed to endure.*

And certainly, if the Son of God would vouchsafe to take the frailty of our flesh, he would not omit the nobler part, our Soul, without which he could not be man. For *Jesus increased in wisdom and stature*; one in respect of his body, the other of his Soul. Wisdom belongeth not to the flesh, nor can the knowledge of God, which is infinite, encrease: he then whose knowledge did improve together with his years must have a subject proper for it, which was no other then a humane Soul. This was the seat of his finite Understanding and directed Will, distinct from the will of his Father, and consequently of his Divine nature; as appeareth by that known submission, *Not my will, but thine, be done.* This was the subject of those Affections and Passions which so manifestly appeared in him: nor spake he any other then a proper language, when before his suffering he said, *My soul is exceeding sorrowfull, even unto death.* This was it which on the Cross, before the departure from the body, he recommended to the Father; teaching us in whose hands the Souls of the departed are: *For when Jesus had cried with a loud voice, he said, Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit: and having said thus, he gave up the ghost.* And as his death was nothing else but the separation of the Soul from his Body; so the life of *Christ* as man did consist in the conjunction and vital union of that Soul with the Body. So that he which was perfect God, was also perfect man, of a reasonable soul and humane flesh subsisting. Which is to be observed and asserted against the* ancient Hereticks, who taught that *Christ* assumed humane flesh, but that the Word or his Divinity was unto that Body in the place of an informing Soul.

* Of this kind two several Sects were most remarkable, the Ari-

ans, and the Apollinarians. Arius taught that *Christ* had nothing of man but the flesh, and with that the Word was joined. Ἄριστος ὁ σαρκὶ μόνον σὰς ἀποκρυφῶς τῆς θεότητος ὁμολογῶν. ἀντὶ τῆς οὗ ἔσανθεν ἐν ἡμῶν ἀνθρώπῳ, τέστι τῆς ψυχῆς, τὸν λόγον ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ λέγει γενέσθαι. Athan. de Adv. Christi. So Felicianus the Arian, in Vigilius de unitate Trin. c. 17. Ita enim a majoribus nostris semper est traditum, quod Christi corpus ad vicem Animæ communis ipsius Filii Dei habitus animarum; nec accessione animalis spiritus indigens fuerit, cui inhabitans fons vitæ potuit conferre quod vixit. Eunomius followed him in this particular: Ἄριστος ὁ ἐν ἑαυτῷ σῶμα μὴ αὐτὴν ἔχων εἰρησῆναι, θεότητα δὲ ψυχῆς ἐννοῦναι τὸν λόγον. Theod. l. 5. cont. Har. c. 13. Apollinarius distinguished between the Soul and the Mind, the ψυχὴ and the νῦς, and acknowledged that the Word assumed the body and the Soul or ψυχὴ of man, but not the Mind or spirit, or the νῦς, but the Word it self was in the place of that. Apollinarianas Apollinarianis instituit, qui de anima Christi ab Ecclesia Catholica dissenserunt, dicentes, sicut Ariani, Deum Christum carnem sine anima suscepisse. In quaestione testimonii Evangelicis victi, mentem, quæ rationalis est anima hominis, non fuisse in anima Christi, sed pro hac ipsum Verbum in ea fuisse, dixerunt. This was then the clear difference betwixt the Arian and Apollinarian Heresie: Apollinarianis quidem carnis & animæ naturam sine mente assumpsisse Deum credunt, Ariani vero carnis tantummodo. Facundus l. 9. So that two things are to be observed in the Apollinarians, their Philosophy, and their Divinity: their Philosophy, is making man consist of three distinct parts, the Body, the Soul, and the Mind; their Divinity, in making the humane nature of *Christ* to consist but of two, the Body and the Soul, and the third to be supplied by the Word. which is excellently expressed by Nemesius de Nat. Hom. in respect of his Philosophy: Τὴν μὲν, ὡν ἔστι ἡ Πλάττωσις, ἀλλὰ τὴν τὴν ψυχῶν, καὶ ἀνὸν τὴν νῦν, δογματίζοντες, ἐκ

ἡρώων τὸν ἀνδρῶπον ὡσεὶ βέλον, σῶμα, καὶ ψυχὴ, καὶ νῦν. Οἷς ἠκολούθησε καὶ Ἀπολλινάριος ὁ τῆς Λαοδικείας ἡρώ-
 μενος ἐπίσκοπος· τῶτον δὲ πρὸς αὐτὸν καὶ δευτέρου τῆς εἰκασίας δόξης, καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ περιγραφόμενος καὶ τὸ εἰκασίον ὁργα-
 and by Theodoret in respect of his Divinity: Σαρκοθελῶν δὲ καὶ θεὸν ἔρησε λόγον, σῶμα καὶ ψυχὴν ἀνελήφθαι ἐκ τῶν λογικῶν, ἀλλὰ
 τῶν ἀλογον, ὡς φυσικῶν, ἢ ὡς ζωτικῶν, πῶς ἐνομάζεται. καὶ ὅτι νῦν ἀλλοῦ πᾶσι τῶν ψυχῶν ἐν λόγῳ, ὡς ἐρησὶν ἀνελήφθαι,
 ἀλλὰ ἀρχαῖαι τῶν θεῶν φύσιν εἰς τὸ παρῶσαι τὸ νῦν τῶν χητῶν.

Thus the whole perfect and † complete nature of Man was assumed by the Word, by him who was *conceived and born* of a woman, and so made a Man. And being the Divine nature which he had before could never cease to be what before it was, nor ever become what before it was not; therefore he who was God before by the Divine Nature which he had, was in this Incarnation made man by that humane nature which he then assumed; and so really and truly was * both God and man. And thus this third Article, from the conjunction with the second, teacheth us no less then the two natures really distinct in *Christ* incarnate.

For if both natures were not preserved complete and distinct in *Christ*, it must be either by the conversion and transubstantiation of one into the other, or by commixtion and confusion of both into one. But neither of these ways can consist with the Person of our Saviour, or the Office of our Mediatour. For if we should conceive such a mixtion and confusion of substances as to make an union of natures, we should be so far from acknowledging him to be both God and Man, that thereby we should profess him to be neither God nor Man, but a Person of a nature as different from both, as all mixt bodies are distinct from each element which concurs unto their composition. Besides, we know there were in *Christ* the Affections proper to the nature of man, and all those Infirmities which belong to us, and cannot be conceived to belong to that nature of which the Divine was but a part. Nor could our Humanity be so commixed or confounded with the Divinity of our Saviour, but that the Father had been made Man as much as the Son, because the Divine nature is the same both of the Father and the Son. Nor ought we to have so † low an esteem of that infinite and independent Being, as to think it so commixed with, or immersed in, the creature.

quodam genere duas naturas in unam arbitremur redactas esse substantiam; hujusmodi enim commixtio partis utriusque corruptio est. Deus enim qui capax est, non capabilis, penetrans, non penetrabilis, implens, non implebilis, qui ubique simul totus, & ubique diffusus est per infusionem potentie suae, misericorditer naturae mixtus est humanae, non humana natura naturae est mixta Divinae. Leporius Libel. Emead.

Again, as the confusion, so the conversion, of natures is impossible. For, first, we cannot with the least shew of probability conceive the Divine nature of *Christ* to be transubstantiated into the humane nature; as those whom they call * *Flandrian Anabaptists* in the *Low-Countries* at this day maintain. There is a plain repugnance even in the supposition: for the nature of Man must be made, the nature of God cannot be made, and consequently cannot become the nature of Man. The immaterial, indivisible and immortal Godhead cannot be divided into a spiritual and incorruptible Soul, and a carnal and corruptible Body; of which two Humanity consisteth. There is no other Deity of the Father then of the Son; and therefore if this was converted into that Humanity, then was the Father also that Man, and grew in knowledge, suffered, and died. We must not therefore so far stand upon the propriety of speech, when it is written, *The † Word was made flesh*, as to destroy the propriety both of the *Word* and of the *flesh*.

both been strange force used by men of contrary judgments, and for contrary ends, as to the word ἡρώ. The Socinians endeavouring to prove, it can have no other sense than simply fruit, the word was flesh. The Flandrian Anabaptists stretching it to the highest sense of factum est, the word was made flesh. It is confessed that the Verb ἡρώ in the use of the Greek language is capable of either interpretation: it is also acknowledged that the most ancient Interpreters were divided in their renditions. For the Syriack rendered it

† Quid à Patre Christus acceperat, nisi quod & induerat? hominem sine dubio, carnis animaeque; texturam. Tertul. de Refut. carnalis c. 34. Hoc toto credente jam mundo, puto quod & Demones confiteantur Filium Dei natum de Maria Virgine, & carnem naturae humanae atque animam suscepisse. S. Hier. Apol. 2. adv. Rufinum. * Νῦν δὲ ἐπεὶ ἔσθ' ἀνθρώπος οὗτος οὗτος ὁ λόγος, ὁ μὲν δὲ ἀμείων, οὗτος τε καὶ ἀνθρώπος. Cl. Alex. adv. Gentes. † Ab his ita credere, ut constet illi

* Teste Episcopio, 1st. theol. l. 4. c. 3.

† In that proposition, ὁ λόγος ὡς ἡρώ, there

וּמִלֵּתָא בְּסֵרָא חַוָּא Et verbum caro fuit; the ancient Latine, Et verbum caro factum est. It cannot be denied but in the Scriptures it hath been used indifferently in either sense. And the same old Vulgar Translation in some places renders it, as the Syriack does here, Matt. 10. 16. *ἵνα ὡς ὁ ὄφεις ἐπὶ τῷ ἄνθρωπῳ*, Estote ergo prudentes sicut serpentes; and 25. *Ἀκούετε τὸ μυστήριον ἵνα γινῇ ὡς ὁ δίδωσκον ὡς ὁ διδάσκων*, Sufficit discipulo ut sit sicut magister ejus. From whence 'tis evident that they placed not the force in the signification of the word *γινῇ*, but in the circumstance of the matter in which 'twas used. Howsoever, neither of these interpretations prove either of these Opinions. For if it be acknowledged that the Word was flesh, and it hath been already proved, and pre-supposed by S. John in his precedent discourse, that the Word had a former being antecedent to his being flesh; it followeth, that he which was before the Word, and was not flesh, if after he were flesh, must be made such. And so the Socinian observation falls. Again, if he which was made flesh was the Word, and after he was made such was still the Word, as certainly he was, and is still the same; then his being made or becoming flesh can no way evacuate that nature in which he did before subsist. And so the Flandrian interpretation is of no validity.

Secondly, we must not, on the contrary, invent a conversion of the humane nature into the Divine, as the *Eutychians* of old did fanfie. For sure the Incarnation could not at first consist in such a conversion, it being unimaginable how that which had no being should be made by being turned into something else. Therefore the Humanity of *Christ* could not at the first be made by being the Divinity of the Word. Nor is the Incarnation so preposterously expressed, as if the flesh were made the Word, but that the Word was made flesh. And if the Manhood were not in the first act of Incarnation converted into the Divine nature, as we see it could not be; then is there no pretence of any time or manner in or by which it was † afterward so transubstantiated. Vain therefore was that old conceit of *Eutyches*, who thought the Union to be made so in the natures, that the Humanity was absorpt and wholly turned into the Divinity, so that by that transubstantiation the humane nature had no longer being. And well did the ancient Fathers, who opposed this Heresie, make use of the Sacramental union between the Bread and Wine and the Body and Bloud of *Christ*, and thereby shewed, that the humane nature of *Christ* is no more really converted into the Divinity, and so ceaseth to be the humane nature, then the substance of the Bread and Wine is really converted into the substance of the Body and Bloud, and thereby ceaseth to be both Bread and Wine. From whence it is by the way observable, that the Church in those days understood no such doctrine as that of

* Transubstantiation.

† This was the proper Opinion of Eutyches, as appeareth by his own Confession in the Council of Chalcedon: *Ὁμοῶς ὁ ἐν δύο φύσιν γενηθεὶς τὴν κρείον ἡμῶν σὰς τῆς ἐνώσεως, μὴ τὴν ἐν ὧν μίαν φύσιν ὁμοῶς*. A.D. 451. Tivo distinct na-

tures he confessed at first, but when the Union was once made he acknowledged but one. But when that union was made he expressed not, nor could his Followers agree; some attributing it to the Conception, some to the Resurrection, others to the Ascension. Howsoever, when they were united, his Opinion clearly was, that the humane nature was so absorpt into the Divine, so wholly made the same, that it ceased wholly to be what it was, and so there was but one, that is, the Divine, nature remained. This is sufficiently expressed by S. Leo, who was the strongest opposer of him, and speaketh thus of his Opinion, *Ser. 8. de Nativ.* Hic autem recentioris sacrilegii profanus altior unionem quidem in Christo duarum confessus est naturarum; sed ipsa unione id dixit effectum; ut ex duabus una remaneret, nullatenus alterius existente substantia. And the *Erasmists* in the Dialogue of Theodoret arguing for that Opinion, being urged to declare whether in that union one nature was made of them both, or one remaining the other did not so, answered plainly, *Ἐγὼ τὴν διότινα λέγω μυστηριώδους, ὑπερβαλὺς ἢ τὰς ταύτας τὴν ἀνθεσπόμενα*. * There can be no time in which we may observe the Doctrine of the Ancients so clearly, as when they write professedly against an Heresie evidently known, and make use generally of the same Arguments against it. Now what the Heresie of Eutyches was is certainly known, and the nature of the Sacrament was generally made use of as an Argument to confute it. *Gelasius* Bishop of Rome hath written an excellent book against Eutyches, De duabus naturis in Christo, in which he propoundeth their Opinion thus; Eutychiani dicunt unam esse naturam, id est, Divinam; and, solā existente Deitate, Humanitas illic esse jam destituit. That then which he disputes against is the Transubstantiation of the humane nature into the Divine. The Argument which he makes use of against it is drawn from the Eucharist: Certe Sacramenta quæ sumimus corporis & sanguinis Christi Divina res est, proper quod & per eadem Divinæ efficiuntur conferres naturæ; & tamen esse non definit substantia vel natura Panis & Vini. Et certe imago & similitudo corporis & sanguinis Christi in actione mysteriorum celebrantur. Satis ergo nobis evidenter ostenditur, hoc nobis ipso Christo Domino sentiendum, quod in ejus imagine profitemur, celebramus, & sumimus, ut sicut in hanc, scilicet, in Divinam, transeant, S. Spiritu perficiente, substantiam, permanentes tamen in suæ proprietate naturæ; sic illud ipsum mysterium principale, cujus nobis efficientiam virtutemque veraciter representant, ex quibus constat proprie permanentibus, unum Christum, quia integrum verumque, permanere demonstrant. In which words 'tis plain he affirms the union of *Christ* to be the principal mystery, the representation of that mystery to be in the Sacrament of the Eucharist: he concludes from thence, that as in the representation the substance of the Bread and Wine remaineth in the propriety of their own nature, so the humane nature of *Christ* in the greater mystery doth still remain. In the margin of this place in the *Bibliotheca Patrum* there is printed Caute, as if there could be any danger in observing the sense of the Fathers, when they speak so expressly and considerately. In the same manner we find a Disputation between an Heretick and a Catholic in the second Dialogue of Theodoret, where *Erasmists*, as an Heretick, asks Orthodoxos by what names he calls the Bread and Wine after Consecration; who answers, the Body and Bloud of *Christ*: From whence *Erasmists* argues, *Ὁσπερ πῖνον καὶ κύματα τῆς διασπορᾶς σαρκαίς τῆς εὐχαρίστιας ἀλλὰ μὴ εἶσι σὰς τῆς ἱερᾶς ἐκκλησίας, μὴ δὲ καὶ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν καλεῖται καὶ εὐπρεπὲς γίνεσθαι* ὡς τὸ διασπορᾶν σῶμα καὶ τὴν ἀνδάνειν εἰς τὴν ὕδατος μεταβολὴν τὴν εἶδος. As the Symbols of the Body and Bloud of *Christ* are one thing before Consecration, and after

συναντῶν, and consequently Christ himself to be a single Person in a double nature, passible and impassible: which once granted, it evidently followeth, that he which was born from eternity was also born in time; for by those several natures he had those several natures; that he which was impassible as God, might and did suffer as Man, because the same Person was of an impassible and a passible nature, impassible as God, passible as Man. Wherefore by that which Nestorius hath confessed, and notwithstanding that which he hath objected, it is evident out of the Nicene Creed, that the Son of God, begotten of his Father before all worlds, was incarnate and made Man; and as evident out of the Apostles Creed, especially expounded by the Nicene, that the same only-begotten Son was conceived by the Holy Ghost, and born of the Virgin Mary.

BY THE HOLY GHOST.

HAVING thus dispatched the consideration of the first Person concerned in this Article, and the Actions contained in it so far as distinctly from the rest they belong to him, we descend unto the other two concerned in the same; and first to him whose Operation did precede in the Conception, the Holy Ghost. Which second part some may think to require a threefold consideration; first, of the Conception, secondly, of the Person, thirdly, of the Operation. But for the Person or existence of the Holy Ghost, that is here onely mentioned obliquely, and therefore to be reserved for another Article where it is propounded directly. And for the Conception it self, that belongeth not so properly to the Holy Ghost, of whom the Act cannot be predicated. For though Christ *was conceived by the Holy Ghost*, yet the Holy Ghost did not conceive him, but said unto the Virgin, *Thou shalt conceive*. There remaineth therefore nothing proper and peculiar to this second part, but that Operation of the Holy Ghost in Christ's Conception, whereby the Virgin was enabled to conceive, and by virtue whereof Christ is said to be conceived by him.

Luke 1.31.

Now when we say the Conception of our Saviour was wrought by the operation of the Spirit, it will be necessary to observe, first, what is excluded by that attribution to the Spirit; secondly, what is included in that operation of the Spirit.

Luke 1.34.

Matt. 1.18.

Luke 2.27.

Luke 2.33.

John 1.45.

Luke 2.48.

Luke 3.23.

For the first of these, we may take notice in the Salutation of the Angel, when he told the blessed Virgin she should conceive and bring forth a son, she said, *How shall this be, seeing I know not a man?* By which words she excludeth first all men, and then her self: all men, by that assertion, *I know not a man*; her self, by the question, *How shall this be, seeing it is so?* First, our Melchizedek had no father on earth, in general; not any man, in particular, not Joseph. 'Tis true, *his mother Mary was espoused to Joseph*: but 'tis as true, *before they came together, she was found with child of the Holy Ghost*. We read in S. Luke, that *the parents brought up the child Jesus into the Temple*: but these Parents were not the Father and the Mother, but, as it followeth, *Joseph and his Mother marvelled at those things which were spoken of him*. 'Tis true, Philip calleth him *Jesus of Nazareth the son of Joseph*; and, which is more, his Mother said unto him, *Behold, thy Father and I have sought thee sorrowing*: but this must be onely the reputed Father of Christ, he being onely, *as was supposed, the son of Joseph, which was the son of Eli*. Whence they must needs appear without all excuse who therefore affirm our Saviour to have been the proper son of Joseph, because the Genealogie belongs to him; whereas in that very place where the Genealogie begins Joseph is called the supposed Father.

* Matt. 1.16. Indeed in our Translation whom may relate to both, as well as one, and to Joseph as well as Mary; but in the Original it evidently belongs to Mary: τὴν Ἰακώβ τὴν ἀνδρα Μαριάμ, ἣς ἦν ἐγγυῆρς Ἰωσὴφ.

How can it then therefore be necessary Christ should be the true son of Joseph, that he may be known to be the son of David, when in the same place where it is proved that Joseph came from David it is denied that Christ came from Joseph? And that not onely in S. Luke, where Joseph begins, but also in S. Matthew, where he ends the Genealogie. *Jacob begat Joseph, the husband as well as Mary*; but in the Original it evidently belongs to Mary: τὴν Ἰακώβ τὴν ἀνδρα Μαριάμ, ἣς ἦν ἐγγυῆρς Ἰωσὴφ.

of

of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ. Howsoever then the Genealogies are described, whether one belong to Joseph, the other to Mary, or both to Joseph, it is from other parts of the Scriptures infallibly certain, not onely that Christ descended lineally from David according to the flesh, but also that the same Christ was begotten of the Virgin Mary, and not by Joseph.

Secondly, as the blessed Virgin excluded all mankind, and particularly Joseph, to whom she was then espoused, by her assertion; so did she exclude her self by the manner of the question, shewing that of her self she could not cause any such Conception. Although she may be thought the root of Jesse, yet could she not germinate of her self; though Eve were the mother of all living, yet generation was founded on the Divine benediction which was given to both together: For God blessed them, and said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth. Though Christ was promised as the seed of the woman; yet we must not imagine that it was in the power of woman to conceive him. When the Virgin thinks it impossible she should conceive because she knew not a man, at the same time she confelleth it otherwise as impossible; and the Angel acknowledgeth as much in the satisfaction of his answer, For with God nothing shall be impossible. God then it was who immediately and miraculously enabled the blessed Virgin to conceive our Saviour; and while Mary, Joseph, and all men are denied, no person which is that God can be excluded from that operation.

But what is included in the Conception by the Holy Ghost, or how his Operation is to be distinguished from the Conception of the Virgin, is not so easily determined. The words by which it is expressed in Scripture are very general: First, as they are delivered by way of promise, prediction, or satisfaction to Mary; The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: secondly, as they suppose the Conception already past; When his Mother Mary was espoused to Joseph, before they came together, she was found with child of the Holy Ghost; and give satisfaction unto Joseph, Fear not to take to thee Mary thy wife, for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost. Now being the expressions in the Scriptures are so general, that from thence the operation of the Spirit cannot precisely be distinguished from the concurrence of the Virgin; much less shall we be able exactly to conclude it by that late distinction made in this Article, conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin; because it is certain that the same Virgin also conceived him according to the prophecy, Thou shalt conceive and bear a son: and therefore, notwithstanding that distinction, the difficulty still remains, how he was conceived by the Spirit, how by the Virgin. Neither will any difference of * Propositions be sufficient rightly to distinguish these operations. Wherefore there is no other way to bound or determine the Action of the Holy Ghost, but by that concurrence of the Virgin which must be acknowledged with it. For if she were truly the Mother of Christ, (as certainly she was, and we shall hereafter prove) then is there no reason to deny to her in respect of him whatsoever is given to other Mothers in relation to the fruit of their womb; and

* As conceived of Spiritu S. natus ex Maria Virgine. S. Aug. indeed hath delivered a distinction between De and Ex, after this manner, speaking

king to those words of the Apostle, Quoniam ex ipso, & per ipsum, & in ipso, sunt omnia. Ex ipso non hoc significat quod de ipso. Quod enim de ipso est potest dici ex ipso, non autem omne quod ex ipso est recte dicitur de ipso. Ex ipso enim cælum & terra, quia ipse fecit eas; non autem de ipso, quia non de substantia sua. Sicut aliquis homo si gignat filium, & faciat domum, ex ipso filius, ex ipso domus; sed filius de ipso, sicut domus de terra & ligno. De Nat. Boni adv. Manich. c. 27. This distinction, having no foundation in the Latine tongue, is ill made use of for the illustration of this Article, because in the Greek language of the Testament there is no such diversity of Prepositions: for as we read of Mary, ἐξ ἧς ἐγενήθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς, so also of the Holy Ghost, ἐκ τῆς ἁγίας τοῦ πνεύματος ἐγενήθη ὁ Χριστός. It is therefore said as well ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος, as ἐκ Μαρίας. Again, the Vulgar observeth no such difference, as rendering for the one, de qua natus est Jesus, and for the other, in utero habens de Spiritu S. Correspondently in the Greek Creeds, συνηβήτη ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος, συνηβήτη ἐκ Μαρίας, or, as in the Nicene, ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος καὶ Μαρίας. And the Latine not onely de Spiritu S. ex Maria Virgine, but sometimes de Sp. S. & Maria Virgine, and

and de Maria Virgine. Chrysol. and S. Aug. often de Trinitate. Wherefore in vain have the Schools first accepted of S. Augustine's distinction, and then applied it to Christ's Conception; first taking the Preposition de to signifie no less then a procession from the substance of the cause, and then acknowledge Christ so begotten of the Holy Ghost, because the eternall Son who was so begotten was of the same substance with the Holy Ghost. Thus Thomas Aquinas has delivered the subtilty, Sum. p. 3. q. 32. a. 2. In Spiritu S. duplex habitudo consideratur respectu Christi. Nam ad ipsum filium Dei, qui dicitur esse conceptus, habet habitudinem consubstantialitatis; ad corpus autem ejus habet habitudinem causæ efficientis. Hæc autem præpositio De utrarque habitudinem designat, sicut cum dicimus hominem aliquem esse de suo patre. Et ideo convenienter dicere possumus Christum esse conceptum de Sp. S. hoc modo, quod efficientia Sp. S. referatur ad corpus assumptum, consubstantialitas vero ad personam assumptentem. But this distinction of Consobstantiality and effective Causality can make nothing for the propriety of the Phrase; for the Preposition De significeth the material cause as well as the efficient, it must do so in respect of that which is the effect, if it require that the thing which is made be made of the substance of that de quo est: then must Christ, according unto that which is made, be made of the substance of the Holy Ghost; or, to speak in the words of the Scripture, Quod in ea natum est de Spiritu Sancto est. Where either that which was conceived in the Virgin must be acknowledged of the substance of the Holy Ghost, or else the Preposition De must not be taken in S. Augustine's sense. Howsoever, being there is but one Preposition, Ex, common to both in the Original Greek; being the Vulgar Translation useth De indifferently for either; being where they have distinguished De and Ex, they have attributed Ex, which doth not signify Consobstantiality, to the Virgin, of whom they confess he did assume the substance of his Body, and De, which significeth (as they say) Consobstantiality, to the Holy Ghost, of whose substance he received nothing: it followeth, that the difference in the Prepositions can no way declare the different concurrence of the Spirit and the Virgin in Christ's Conception.

Joh. 1. 13.

consequently, no more is left to be attributed to the Spirit, then what is necessary to cause the Virgin to perform the actions of a Mother. When the Scripture speaketh of Regeneration, or the second birth, it denieth all which belongeth to natural procreation, describing the *sons of God* as *begotten not of blouds, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God*: And in the Incarnation of our Saviour, we remove all will or lust of the flesh, we deny all will of man concurring; but as the *blouds* in the language of the *Hebrews* did signifie that substance of which the flesh was formed in the womb, so we acknowledge in the generation of *Jesus Christ*, that he was made of the substance of his Mother.

But as he was so made of the substance of the Virgin, so was he not made of the substance of the Holy Ghost, whose essence cannot at all be made. And because the Holy Ghost did not beget him by any communication of his essence, therefore he is not the Father of him, though he were conceived by him. And if at any time I have said, *Christ* was begotten by the Holy Ghost of the *Virgin Mary*, if the Ancients speak as if he † generated the Son, it is not so to be understood, as if the Spirit did perform any proper act of generation, such as is the foundation of Paternity.

† As Chrysol.
logus Scrm. 57.
Ubi Spiritus
generat, Virgo
parurit,
totum divi-
num geritur,
nihil huma-
num. Et Ser.
62. Stupenti
mundo solus
aperi quid
est, quod
Spiritus ge-
nerat, Virgo
concepit,
Virgo parit.
* Deus ipse
met ad san-
guinem Ma-
riæ addidit a-

liam materiam, ex quibus deinde Christus conceptus & natus est. Smalcus, De vero & Natuali Dei Filio, c. 2. Verum manet generationem & hanc dici posse, quatenus in Deum ea cadere potest, si ad sanguinem Mariæ addita sit ex parte Dei materia, ex qua cum sanguine Mariæ juncta natus sit Christus. Ib. c. 3. What this was thus added to the substance of the Virgin, be elsewhere explains: Nos Dei virtutem in Virginis utero aliquam substantiam creatam vel immisitisse aut ibi creasse affirmamus, ex qua, juncto eo quod ex ipsius Virginis substantia accessit, verus homo generatus fuit. This he doth not only without any authority affirm, but ground upon it the Sonship of Christ. For so it follows; Alias enim homo ille Dei Filius à conceptione & nativitate proprie non fuisset. And again; Necesitas magna fuit ut Christus ab initio vitæ suæ esset Deo Filius, qualis futurus non fuisset, nisi Dei virtute aliquid creatum fuisset quod ad constituendum Christi corpus una cum Mariæ sanguine concurrir. Thus while they deny the eternall generation of the Son, they establish a temporal in such manner as is not consonant with that Word which they pretend wholly to follow, and have made a body of Christ partly descending from the Fathers, partly not: and whereas as man he is like to us in all things, sin only excepted; they have invented a body partly like ours, part y not, and so in no part totally like. Indeed some of the Ancients did speak so as to make the Holy Ghost the semen Dei: as Tertullian; Ergo jam Dei filius ex Patris Dei semine, i. e. Spiritu, ut esset hominis filius, caro ei sola erat ex hominis carne sumenda sine viri semine. Vacabat enim viri semen apud habentem Dei semen. De carne Christi c. 18. And S. Hilary calls it Seminem incunantis Spiritus efficaciam, l. 2. de Trin. But in this they

they only understood the Operation of the Spirit, loco feminis. And whosoever spoke of any proper semen, they abhorred; as appears by the 191. Sermon de Tempore: Nec, ut quidam sceleratissimi opinantur, Spiritum S. dicimus pro femine fuisse, sed potentia & virtute Creatoris operatum. I know not whether be the greatest folly; to make the holy Ghost the Father, as these men have done, by creating part of his body by way of seminal conjunction; or to make the same Spirit Mother of Christ, as the Nazareans did. In Evangelio Hebræorum quod lectitant Nazareni Saluator inducitur loquens, Modo me accipit Mater mea, Spiritus Sanctus. There is only this difference, that one is founded upon no authority of Scripture, the other upon the authority of a pretended, but no Scripture: the one maketh the Holy Ghost a partial, the other a total, mother.

The belief of this is necessary to prevent all fear or suspicion of spot in this Lamb, of Sin in this Jesus. Whatsoever our original corruption is, howsoever displeasing unto God, we may be from hence assured there was none in him, in whom alone God hath declared himself to be well pleased. *Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean?* saith Job; a clean and undefiled Redeemer out of an unclean and defiled nature? He whose name is holiness, whose operation is to sanctifie, the Holy Ghost. Our Jesus was like unto us in all things, as born of a woman; sin onely excepted, as conceived by the Holy Ghost. X This original and total sanctification of the humane nature was first necessary, to fit it for the personal union with the Word, who, out of his infinite love, humbled himself to become flesh, and at the same time, out of his infinite purity, could not defile himself by becoming sinfull flesh. Secondly, the same sanctification was as necessary in respect of the end for which he was made man, the redemption of mankind: that as the † first Adam was the fountain of our impurity, so the second Adam should also be the pure fountain of our righteousness. ^a God sending his own son in the likeness of sinfull flesh, condemned sin in the flesh; which he could not have condemned, had he been sent in sinfull flesh. ^b The Father made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him; which we could not have been made in him, but that he ^c did no sin, and knew no sin. For whosoever is sinfull wanteth a Redeemer; and he could have redeemed none who stood in need of his own redemption. We are redeemed ^d with the precious blood of Christ: therefore precious, because of a Lamb without blemish and without spot. Our atonement can be made by no other High-priest then by him who is ^e holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners. We cannot ^f know that he was manifested to take away our sins, except we also know that in him is no sin. Wherefore, being it is so necessary to believe the original holiness of our humane nature in the Person of our Saviour; it is as necessary to acknowledge that way by which we may be fully assured of that sanctity, his conception by the Holy Ghost.

† Illud unum peccatum, quod tam magnum in loco & habitu tantæ felicitatis admissum est, ut in uno homine originaliter, atque, ut ita dixerim, radicaliter, totum genus humanum damnaretur; non solvitur ac diluitur nisi per unum Mediatorem Dei & hominum, hominem Christum Jesum.

qui solus potuit ita nasci, ut ei opus non esset renasci. S. Aug. Each. c. 48. ^a Rom. 8. 3. ^b 2 Cor. 5. 21. ^c 1 Pet. 2. 22. ^d 1 Pet. 1. 19. ^e Heb. 7. 26. ^f 1 Job. 3. 5. In quo non est peccatum, ipse venit auferre peccatum. Nam si esset in illo peccatum, auferendum esset illi, non ipse auferret. S. Aug.

Again, it hath been * observed, that by this manner of Christ's conception is declared the freedom of the Grace of God. For as the Holy Ghost is God, so is he also called the gift of God: and therefore the humane nature in its first original, † without any precedent merit, was formed by the Spirit, and in its formation sanctified, and in its sanctification united to the Word; so that the Grace was coexistent, and in a manner connatural with it. The Mystery of the Incarnation is frequently attributed in the Scriptures to the love, mercy and goodness of God. ^a Through the tender mercy of our God the day-spring from on high hath visited us: In this ^b the kindness and love of God our Saviour

* By S. Aug. Ex hoc, quod de Sp. S. est secundum hominem natiuitas Christi, quid aliud quam ipsa gratia demonstratur? Each. c. 37.

Christus de Sp. S. non sicut filius, & de Maria virginæ sicut filius, insinuat nobis gratiam Dei, qua homo, nullis precedentibus meritis, in ipso exordio naturæ suæ quo esse cœpit, verbo Dei copularetur in tantam Personæ unitatem, ut idem ipse esset filius Dei qui filius hominis, & filius hominis qui filius Dei: ac sic in humanæ naturæ assumptione fieret quodammodo ipsa gratia naturalis, quæ nullum peccatum posset admittere. Quæ gratia propterea per Sp. S. fuerat significanda, quia ipse proprie sic est Deus, ut etiam dicatur Dei Donum. Id. c. 40. ^a Luk. 1. 78. ^b Tit. 3. 4.

toward

toward man appeared. And though these and such other Scriptures speak properly of the love and mercy of God to man alone, offered unto him in the Incarnation of our Saviour, and so directly exclude the merits of other men onely; yet because they speak so generally with reference to God's mercy, they may well be thought to exclude all universally. Especially considering the impossibility of * merit in *Christ's* Humanity, in respect of his Conception; because all desert necessarily precedeth its reward, and *Christ* was not man before he was conceived, nor can that merit which is not.

* Cum ad naturam Dei non pertineat natura humana, ad

personam tamen unigeniti Filii Dei per gratiam pertinet humana natura; & tantam gratiam, ut nulla sit major, nulla prorsus æqualis. Neque enim illam susceptionem hominis ulla merita præcesserunt, sed ab illa susceptione ne ita ejus cuncta coeperunt. S. Aug. Tract. 82. in Joan.

Thirdly, whereas we are commanded to be holy, and that even as he is holy; by this we learn from what foundation this holiness must flow. We bring no such purity into the world, nor are we sanctified in the womb: but as he was sanctified at his Conception, so are we at our Regeneration. He was conceived not by man, but by the Holy Ghost; ; and we are *not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God*. The same overhadowing power which formed his humane nature reformeth ours; and the † same Spirit assureth us a remission of our sins, which caused in him an exemption from all sin. He which was born for us upon his Incarnation, is born † within us upon our Regeneration.

Job. 1. 13.

† Eâ gratiâ fit ab initio fidei suæ homo quicumque;

Christianus, quâ gratiâ homo ille ab initio suo factus est Christus. De ipso Spiritu & hic renatus, de quo est ille natus. Eodem Spiritu fit in nobis remissio peccatorum, quo Spiritu factum est ut nullum haberet ille peccatum. S. August. de Prædest. Sanct. c. 15.

84. 17.

¶ Nolite desperare; quod semel natum est ex Maria, quotidie & in nobis nascitur. Hieron. comm. in Psal. 84. 17.

All which considered, we may now render a clear explication of this part of the Article, whereby every person may understand what he is to profess, and express what is the Object of his Faith, when he saith, I believe in *Jesus Christ, which was conceived by the Holy Ghost*. For hereby he ought to intend thus much; I assent unto this as a most necessary and infallible truth, that the onely-begotten Son of God, begotten by the Father before all worlds, very God of very God, was conceived and born, and so made man, taking to himself the humane nature, consisting of a Soul and body, and conjoyning it with the Divine in the unity of his person. I am fully assured that the Word was in this manner made flesh, that he was really and truly conceived in the womb of a woman, but not after the manner of men; not by carnal copulation, not by the common way of humane propagation, but by the singular, powerfull, invisible, immediate operation of the Holy Ghost, whereby a Virgin was beyond the law of nature enabled to conceive, and that which was conceived in her was originally and completely sanctified. And in this latitude I profess to believe in *Jesus Christ, which was conceived by the Holy Ghost*.

BORN

from all others of the same common nomination, as *Jacob* is called *Israel*, and *Abraham* the Friend of God, or Father of the faithfull; so is this *Mary* sufficiently characterized by that inseparable companion of her name, *the Virgin*. For the full explication whereof more cannot be required, then that we shew first that the *Messias* was to be born of a Virgin, according to the prediction of the Prophets; secondly, that this *Mary*, of whom *Christ* was born, was really a Virgin when she bare him, according to the relations of the Evangelists; thirdly, that being at once the mother of the Son of God and yet a Virgin, she continued for ever in the same Virginity, according to the Tradition of the Fathers, and the constant doctrine of the Church.

The obdurate Jew, that he might more easily avoid the truth of the second, hath most irrationally denied the first; resolved rather not to understand *Moses* and the Prophets, than to acknowledge the interpretation of the Apostles. It will therefore be necessary, from those Oracles which were committed unto them, to shew the promised *Messias* was born after a miraculous manner, to be the Son of a woman, not of a man. The first promise of him seems to speak no less, *The seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head*: for as the name of *seed* is not generally or collectively to be taken for the generation of mankind, but determinately and individually for that one seed, which is *Christ*; so the woman is not to be understood with relation unto man, but particularly and determinately to that sex from which alone immediately that seed should come.

According to this first Evangelical promise followed that prediction of the Prophet, *The Lord hath created a new thing on the earth, a woman shall compass a man.* That new creation of a man is therefore *new*, and therefore a *creation*, because wrought in a woman onely, without a man, compassing a man. Which interpretation of the Prophet is ancient, † literal and clear; and whatsoe're the *Jews* have invented to elude it, is frivolous and forced. For while they force the phrase of *compassing a man* in the latter part of the prediction to any thing else then a Conception, they do not onely wrest the Scripture, but contradict the former part of the promise, making the new creation neither new, as being often done, nor a creation, as being easie to perform.

† For it is not to be denied that the phrase *compassing a man* signifies *circumcundare*, or *circumcise*. *R. Judah* has observed but one interpretation

† For it is not
to be denied
that the proper
signification of
כסס is cir-
cundare, or
cingere. R.
Judah has ob-
served but one
interpretation
of this Verb.

of this verb, ככל signifies 'incompassing', or 'circumcision'. Therefore those words, נקברה חסבב גבר, must literally import no less than that a woman shall encompass, or enclose, a man, which, with the addition of a new creation, may well bear the interpretation of a miraculous conception. Especially considering that the ancient Jews did acknowledge this sense, and did apply it determinately to the Messiah: as appeareth in Berelch Rabba Paraph. 89. where shewing that God doth heal with that with which he woundeth, he saith, as he punished Israel in a Virgin, so would he also heal them with a Virgin, according to the Prophet, The Lord hath created a new thing on the earth, a woman shall compass a man. By the testimony of R. Huna in the name of R. Idi and R. Josiah the son of Levi, וה' מלך המשיח שני היום, This is Messiah the King, of whom it is written, (Psal. 137.) This day have I begotten thee. And again in Midrash Talm., upon the 2. Psal. R. Huna in the name of R. Idi, speaking of the sufferings of the Messiah, saith that when his hour is come, God shall say, וכן הוה אומר אני עלי לבראתי בריה חדשה היום ולדות, I must create him with a new creation. And so (by virtue of that new creation) he saith, This day have I begotten thee. From whence, it appeareth that this sense is of itself largely clear, and that the ancient Rabbins did understand it of the Messiah, whence it followeth that the later interpretations are but to avoid the truth which we profess, that Jesus was born of a Virgin; and therefore is this Christ.

But if this prophetic of *Jeremie* seem obscure, it will be sufficiently cleared by that of *Isaiah*; ^a *Behold, a Virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Emmanuel.* The ancient Jews, † immediately upon the promulgation of the Gospel, understanding well how near this place did press them, ^{Isa. 7. 14.} ^{How soon} these Objections were made use of by the

gave

¶ And as they
soan began, so
did they go on
with this ob-
jection: Ho-
die, toto jam
credente
mundo, argu-
mentantur
Judæi, Esaiā
docente de
Maria & vir-
ginitate ejus.
Ecce virgo in
utero concipiet,
& pariet
filium, in
Hebræo ju-
venculam
scriptum esse,
non virginem,
id est, balnea,
non bethula.
¶ Dicunt Ju-
dæi, Provo-
cemus istam
prædicationem
Esaiæ,
& faciamus
comparatio-
nem, an
Christo qui
jam venit
competat illi
primo nomen

quod Esaias prædicavit, & insignia ejus quæ de eo nunciavit. Equidem Esaias prædicat eum Emmanuelem vocari oportere, de-
hinc virtutem sumpturum Damasci & spolia Samariæ adversus regem Assyriorum. Porro, inquit, iste qui venit neque sub
ejusmodi nomine est dictus, neque re bellicæ functus. Tirrell, adv. Judæos. ¶ So Justine testifieth of the Jews, speaking to
Trypho, and in him to them: Ἐγγίζει γὰρ ὁ σῶς τὸν κόσμον ὡς εἰς Ἐξουίαν & ἡ σωτηρία ὑμῶν βασιλεία. And Trypho replies again to
Justine; Ἰδοὺ οὗτος ἐκείνους εἰς Χριστὸν & ἐμπίστεον ἀποδείκνυσιν εἰρηδῶς, ἡμεῖς γὰρ εἰς Ἐξουίαν αὐτοῦ λίγα μὲν παραστήσομεν.
¶ The LXX, Ἰδὲ ἡ παρθένος ἐν γαστρὶ ἡνίκα. ¶ 'Tis true, the rest of the Interpreters, concurring with the Objection of the Jews,
translated it, Ἰδὲ ἡ νεάνις, i.e. adolescentula, or juvenula. But as their antiquity, so their authority is far short of the LXX,
especially in this case. I shall not need to shew how the Origination of עֶלְמָה from עַלְמָה proves no less. We know the affinity
of the Punic tongue with the Hebrew; and by the testimony of S. Hierome, Lingua Punicā, quæ de Hebræorum fontibus manare
dicitur, proprie virgo alma appellatur. 2 King. 16. 2. King. 18. 2. ¶ It is the known saying of
Hillel, recorded in Sanhedrin c. Chelik, שֶׁכָּבַד אֶתְּלֹוֹ בְּיָמֵי חֻקִּיָּהוּ לִישְׂרָאֵל מִשֵּׁחַ לְהָם מִשֵּׁחַ לְהָם. There is no Mes-
sias to the Israelites, because they have already enjoyed him in the days of Hezekiah. Divers of the later Rabbins endeavour to
mollify these words of Hillel by their several expositions, but in vain. And R. Joseph understood him better, who thought he took
away all expectation of a Messiah, and therefore fairly prayed for him, Condoner Dominus hoc R. Hillel. Howsoever, it appears
that from two principles, whereof one was false, he gathered that false conclusion. For first, he thought these words in Isaiah were
spoken of the Messiah: which proposition was true. Secondly, he conceived that those words were spoken of Hezekiah, and fulfilled in
him: which Proposition was false. From hence he inferred, that the Israelites were not to expect a Messiah after Hezekiah: which
Conclusion was also false.

Luk. 1. 27.

Mat. 1. 18.

Secondly, as we are taught by the predictions of the Prophets, that a
Virgin was to be Mother of the promised Messiah; so are we assured by
the infallible relations of the Evangelists, that this Mary, the Mother of Jesus,
whom we believe to be Christ, was a Virgin when she bare him, when she
brought forth her first-born Son. That she was a Virgin when and after she
was espoused unto Joseph, appeareth by the narration of S. Luke: For, the
Angel Gabriel was sent from God to a Virgin espoused to a man whose name was
Joseph. After the Salutation of that Angel, that she still was so, appeareth
by her question, How shall this be, seeing I know not a man? That she conti-
nued so after she conceived by the Holy Ghost, is evident from the rela-
tion of S. Matthew: For when she was espoused unto Joseph, before they came
together, she was found with child of the Holy Ghost. That she was a Virgin
not only while she was with child, but even when she had brought forth,

is also evident out of his application of the Prophecies: *Behold, a Virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a Son.* For by the same prediction it is as manifest that a Virgin should bring forth, as conceive a Son. Neither was her act of Parturition more contradictory to Virginity, then that former of Conception.

Mat. 1. 23.
† Hæc est Virgo quæ in utero concepit, virgoque peperit filium. Sic enim scriptum est,

Ecce, Virgo in utero concipiet, & pariet filium. Non enim concepturam tantummodo Virginem, sed & parituram Virginem dixit. S. Ambrosius. Epist. 7. ad Sirivicum. So he argued from the Prophecy, and S. Aug. from the Creed: Si vel per nascentem corrumpetur ejus integritas, non jam ille de Virgine nasceretur; cumque falso, quod absit, de Virgine natum tota confiteretur Ecclesia, quæ, imitans ejus matrem, quotidie parit membra, & Virgo est. Eucher. c. 34. As also S. Ambrose in the same Epistle: Quæ potuit Virgo concipere, potuit Virgo generare; quum semper conceptus præcedat, partus sequatur. Sed si doctrinis non creditur sacerdotum, credatur oraculis Christi, credatur monitis Angelorum, credatur Symbolo Apostolorum, quod Ecclesia Romana intermatum semper custodit & servat. And S. Basil upon occasion of the same Prophecy: ἡ αὐτὴ γυνὴ καὶ παρθένος καὶ μήτηρ, καὶ ἐν τῷ ἁμαρτωλῷ καὶ παρθένης μερούσα, καὶ τῷ τῷ τεκνογονίας εὐλογίαν κληρονομήσα. Hom. 25. Virgo peperit, quia Virgo concepit. Vigil. de Unitate Trinit. c. 10.

Thirdly, we believe the Mother of our Lord to have been not only before and after his Nativity, but also for ever, the most immaculate and blessed Virgin. For although it may be thought sufficient † as to the mystery of the Incarnation, that when our Saviour was conceived and born his Mother was a Virgin; though whatsoever should have followed after could have no reflective operation upon the first fruit of her womb; though there be no farther mention in the Creed then that he was *born of the Virgin Mary*: yet the peculiar eminency and unparalleled privilege of that Mother, the special honour and reverence due unto that Son, and ever paid by her, the regard of that Holy Ghost who came upon her, and the power of the Highest which overshadowed her, the singular goodness and piety of Joseph, to whom she was espoused, have persuaded the Church of God in all Ages to believe that she still continued in the same Virginity, and therefore is to be acknowledged the * Ever-Virgin Mary. As if the Gate of the Sanctuary in the Prophet Ezechiel were to be understood of her; *This gate shall be shut, it shall not be opened, and no man shall enter in by it: because the Lord the God of Israel hath entered in by it, therefore it shall be shut.*

† Many indeed have taken the boldness to deny this truth, because not recorded in the sacred Writ; and not onely so, but to assert the contrary as delivered in the Scriptures; but with no success. For though, as they object, S. Matthew testifieth that Joseph knew not Mary, untill she had brought forth her first-born Son, from whence they would infer, that afterwards he knew her;

of Mary no longer then to Christ's nativity. In tantum nescio quis prorupit infaniam, ut assereret negatam fuisse Mariam à Salvatore, eo quod post natiuitatem illius juncta fuerit Joseph. Homil. 7. in Lucam. Tertullian himself was produced as an assertor of the same opinion; nor does S. Hierome deny it, though I think he might have done it. Apollinaris, or at least his followers, delivered the same, says Epiphanius; and Eunomius with his, καὶ Ἰωσήφ καὶ τῷ ἀφ' ὧν καὶ οὐρανὸν (καὶ τὴν ἐκ τῆς παρθένου). Photius out of Philostorgius. Not that these words in Photius were the words of Philostorgius, for he was clearly an Eunomian; and therefore would never express their opinions with as ἐκ τῆς παρθένου. And as he always commended Eunomius, so was he not commended but by an Eunomian, that is, a man of his own Sect. As that Epigram,

Εὐνομίαν.

Ἰστέλλω ἐπὶ τὴν αὐτὴν οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλος Κορηῖος.

which I therefore mention, because Gotofred hath made an unnecessary emendation in the Verse, ἐπὶ τὴν αὐτὴν, and a worse interpretation in the Inscription, taking the Eunomian to be a Catholick, and the name of the Sect for the name of a man; and confirming this error by a greater mistake, saying Eunomianus was the name of a man, twice spoken of in Suidas, once in Εὐνομίαν, and again in Εὐνοσι. 'Tis true indeed Suidas says expressly, Εὐνομίδης, ὄνομα κνέον, and immediately adds these words, καὶ ἡ Εὐνομίαν ἐστὶν Βελιδίου. τὸ δὲ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλος, as if Belisarius had baptized one whose name was Eunomianus. But the words are taken out of Photius in Hist. Arian. pag. 2. from whence it appears that he who was baptized was by name Theodosius, and by Sect an Eunomian. And whatsoever his name was who wrote that Epigram on the History of Philostorgius, he was certainly by Sect an Eunomian, and that was intended in the Inscription, written without question by some Catholick, who thought no man could commend the History of Philostorgius but one of his own opinion. These contradictors of the perpetual Virginity of the Mother of our Lord afterwards increased to a greater number, whom Epiphanius calls by a general name Antidicomarianite. And from him S. Aug. Antidicomarianite appellati sunt Hæretici, qui Mariæ Virginitati usque adeo contradicunt, ut affirmant eam post Christum natum viro suo fuisse commixtam, de Hæres. condemned under that name by the sixth General Council, Act. 11. The same were called by the Latines Helvidiani, from Helvidius, (a disciple of Auxentius the Arian) whose name is most made use of, because refused by S. Hierome. He was followed by Jovinian a Monk of Milan, as S. Hierom testifieth; though S. Augustine delivereth his opinion otherwise, Virginitatem Mariæ destruebat, dicens eam pariendo fuisse

ex priore uxore, quæ convixerat ipsi antequam duceret Mariam. 14. *Matt. 13. 5.* This Jacobus mentions by Origen is the same with him whom Eustatius mentions in *Hexamero*, Ἀχιὸν ἢ τὴν ἱσταν λὺ δέξον ἀπὸ τῆς ἀγίας Μαρίας Ἰακώβος καὶ Ἰωάννης. where he reckons Joseph inter τὰς γυναῖκες; and Epiphanius calls Ἰακώβος Ἐφεσίου. S. Hierome therefore observing that the former opinion of Joseph's sons was founded merely upon an Apocryphal writing, and being ready to assert the Virginity of Joseph as well as Mary, first invented the other solution in the kindred of Mary, as founded not only in the language but also testimony of the Scriptures: Quidam fratres Domini de alia uxore Joseph filios suspicantur, sequentes deliramenta Apocryphorum, & quardam Ezechiam mulierem confingentes. Nos autem, sicut in libro quem contra Helvidium scripsimus continetur, fratres Domini non filios Joseph, sed consobrinos Salvaroris, Mariæ liberos intelligimus materis Domini, quæ esse dicitur mater Jacobi minoris & Joseph & Judæ, quos in alio Evangelii loco fratres Domini legimus appellatos. Fratres autem consobrinos dici omnis Scriptura demonstrat. S. Hieron. in *Matth. 12. 49.* After S. Hierome S. Aug. embraced this Opinion: Consanguinei Virginis Mariæ fratres Domini dicebantur. Erat enim consuetudinis Scripturarum appellare fratres quoslibet consanguineos & cognationis propinquos. in *Joh. Tract. 28. item Tract. 10. & contra Faustum l. 22. 35.* Although therefore he seem to be indifferent in his Exposition of the Epistle to the Galatians, Jacobus Domini frater, vel ex filiis Joseph de alia uxore, vel ex cognatione Mariæ matris ejus, debet intelligi: yet because this Exposition was written while he was a Presbyter, and those before mentioned after he was made a Bishop; therefore the former was taken for his undoubted opinion, and upon his and S. Hierom's authority hath been generally since received in the Latine Church.

And yet this difficulty, though usually no farther considered, is not fully cleared: for they which impugned the perpetuall Virginity of the mother of our Lord urged it farther, pretending that as the Scriptures called them the Brethren of Christ, so they also shewed them to be the Sons of Mary the Mother of Christ. For first, the Jews express them particularly by their names, Is not his Mother called Mary? and his brethren James, and Joses, and Simon, and Judas? * Therefore James and Joses were undoubtedly the brethren of Christ, and the same were also as unquestionably the sons of Mary: For among the women at the Cross we find ^b Mary Magdalene, and Mary the Mother of James and Joses. Again, this Mary they think can be no other then the Mother of our Lord, because they find her early in the morning at the Sepulchre, with ^c Mary Magdalene and Salome; and it is not † probable that any should have more care of the body of the son then the mother. She then who was certainly present at the Cross, was not probably absent from the Sepulchre. Wherefore they conclude, she was the mother of Christ, who was the mother of James and Joses, the brethren of Christ.

Matt. 13. 55.

* From this place Helvidius argued, Hæc eadem vocabula in alio loco nominari, & eosdem esse fratres Domini, filios Mariæ. S. Hier. advers. Helv. And from the next he concluded, Ecce

Jacobus & Joses, filii Mariæ, quos Judæi fratres appellarunt. b *Matt. 27. 56.* c *Mark 16. 1.* † Here Helvidius exclaiming triumphed, Quam miserum erit & impium de Maria hoc sentire, ut cum aliæ femine curam sepulchræ habuerint, matrem ejus dicamus absentem!

Joh. 19. 25.

Matth. 27. 56.

Mark 15. 40.

Matth. 28. 1.

† Jacobus qui

appellatur

frater Domini,

cognomine

Justus,

ut nonnulli existimant,

Joseph ex alia uxore,

ut autem mihi videtur,

Mariæ sororis Matris Domini,

cujus Joannes in libro suo

meminit, filius.

S. Hieron. in catalogo.

Sicut in sepulchro ubi positum est corpus Domini,

nec antea nec postea mortuus jacuit

sic uterus Mariæ nec antea nec postea quicquam mortale suscepit.

And now the urging of this Argument will produce a greater clearness in the solution of the question. For if it appear that Mary the mother of James and Joses was different and distinguished from Mary the Virgin; then will it also be apparent that the brethren of our Lord were the sons of another mother, for James and Joses were so called. But we read in S. John, that there stood by the Cross of Jesus his mother, and his mother's sister, Mary the wife of Cleophas, and Mary Magdalene. In the rest of the Evangelists we find at the same place Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of James and Joses; and again at the Sepulchre, Mary Magdalene and the other Mary: wherefore that other Mary by the conjunction of these testimonies appeareth to be Mary the wife of Cleophas, and the mother of James and Joses; and consequently James and Joses, the brethren of our Lord, were not the sons of Mary his mother, but of the † other Mary, and therefore called his brethren, according to the language of the Jews, because that the other Mary was the sister of his mother.

Notwithstanding therefore all these pretensions, there can be nothing found to raise the least suspicion of any interruption of the ever-blessed Marie's perpetuall Virginity. For as she was a Virgin when she conceived, and after

after she brought forth our Saviour; so did she continue in the same state and condition, and was commended by our Saviour to his beloved Disciple, as a mother onely now of an adopted son.

The third Consideration belonging to this part of the Article is, how this Virgin was a Mother, what the foundation was of her maternall relation to the Son of God, what is to be attributed unto her in this sacred Nativity beside the immediate work of the power of the Highest, and the influence of the Holy Ghost. For we are here to remember again the most ancient form of this Article, briefly thus delivered, *Born of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary*; as also that the word † *Born* was not taken precisely for the Nativity of our Saviour, but as comprehending in it whatsoever belonged to his humane Generation: and when afterward the Conception was attributed to the Spirit, the Nativity to the Virgin; it was not so to be understood, as if the Spirit had conceived him, but the blessed Virgin by the power and operation of the Spirit.

First therefore, we must acknowledge a true, real and proper Conception, by which the Virgin did conceive of her * own substance the true and real substance of our Saviour, according to the prediction of the Prophet, *Behold, a Virgin shall conceive*, and the Annunciation of the Angel, *Behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb*. From whence our Saviour is exprelly termed by *Elisabeth*, * the * fruit of her womb.

* Tantum ad
nativitatem
carnis ex se
dedit, quan-
tum ex se co-
minar eden-
dorum cor-
porum susce-

ptis originibus impendunt. S. Hil. l. 15. de Trin.

† That is, by a proper Conception, (συλλαβὴν ἐν γαστρὶ * the Syriac in one word ܡܕܝܬܐ, ac si diceret, ventrescere. So the LXX translated the simple ܡܕܝܬܐ, ἐν γαστρὶ ἄνθρωπος. As therefore ἐν γαστρὶ ἐχόν expresses a proper Gravitation, so doth ἐν γαστρὶ συλλαβὴν a proper Conception. According to that expression of Gregory Nazianzen, θεῖκος ἐστὶν ὅτι χωρὶς ἀνδρός * ἀνδρῶν κῆρος ἐστὶν νόμος κηρύττει. Ep. 1. ad Cledon. * Luke 1. 42. * Heb. ܡܕܝܬܐ ܡܕܝܬܐ.

Secondly, as she did at first really and properly conceive, so did she also nourish and encrease the same body of our Saviour, once conceived, by the true substance of her own; by which ^b she was found with child of the Holy Ghost, and is described going with Joseph to be taxed, ^c being great with child, and pronounced happy by that loud cry of the woman in the Gospel, ^d Blessed is the womb that bare thee.

^b Matt. 1. 18.
^c Luke 2. 5.
^d ὡς ἐγγύς.
^d Luke 11. 27.
καὶ οὕτως ἡ βα-
σιλειὰ σου.

Thirdly, when Christ was thus conceived and grew in the womb of the blessed Virgin, she truly and really did bring forth her Son by a true and proper Parturition; and Christ thereby was properly born by a † true Nativity. For as we read, *Elisabeth's full time came that she should be delivered, and she brought forth a son*; so in the like simplicity of expression, and propriety of speech, the same Evangelist speaks of Mary, *The days were accomplished that she should be delivered, and she brought forth her first-born son*.

† Περὶ τῆς
τοκευτικῆς
ἐκείνης ἡ-
μερᾶς, ἀληθῶς
ὡς ἐν γαστρὶ
Δαβὶδ καὶ
σαρὰ, ὡς ἐν
ἐμῇ καὶ ὁ
ἀληθὴς καὶ
ἐκείνη ὡς
παρθένα. Ig.
Ep. ad Smyr.
* Luke 1. 57.
* Luke 2. 6, 7.
* Veri & pro-
prij filij quis
nisi absurdif-

Wherefore from these three, a true Conception, Nutrition and Parturition, we must acknowledge that the blessed Virgin was * truly and properly the Mother of our Saviour. And so is she frequently stiled the Mother of Jesus in the language of the Evangelists, and by Elisabeth particularly the mother of her Lord, as also by the general consent of the Church (* because he which was so born of her was God,) the † *Deipara*; which being a compound title begun in the Greek Church, was resolved into its parts by the Latines, and so the Virgin was plainly named the † Mother of God.

simus neget vere & proprie esse matrem? Facundus l. 1. c. 4. Hoc & ad credendum difficile, & dignum controversiā videbatur, utrum Deum illa Virgo genuerit: ceterum quod vere & proprie genuerit, quicquid est ille quem genuit, nulli dignum disceptationis apparet. ibid.

† Πᾶς ὁ ὁσολόξος ἡ Θεοῦ ἡδὲ ἡδὲ ἡδὲ ἡδὲ Θεοῦ. Theod. Abucaya. * This name was first in use in the Greek Church, who, delighting in the happy compositions of that language, called the blessed Virgin Θεοτόκος. From whence the Latines in imitation stiled her Virginem Deiparam & Dei genitricem. Meursius in his Glossary sets the Original of this Title in the time of Justinian: Inditum hoc nomen est matri Domini ac Servatoris nostri Jesu Christi a Synodo V. Constantinopolitana tempore Justiniani. whereas this was not the Original, but the confirmation, of that Title. In hac Synodo Catholica est institutum, ut Beata Maria semper-virgo Θεοτόκος diceretur: quia, sicut Catholica fides habet, non hominem solum, sed vere Deum & Ho-

prediction, ^a *From henceforth all generations shall call me blessed*; but the obligation is ours, to call her, to esteem her so. ¶ If *Elizabeth* cried out *with so loud a voice, Blessed art thou among women*, when *Christ* was but newly conceived in her womb; what expressions of honour and admiration can we think sufficient now that *Christ* is in Heaven, and that Mother with him? * Far be it from any Christian to derogate from that special privilege granted her, which is incommunicable to any other. We cannot bear too reverend a regard unto the *Mother of our Lord*, so long as we give her not that worship which is due unto the Lord himself. Let us keep the language of the Primitive Church: † Let her be honour'd and esteem'd, let him be worshipp'd and ador'd.

^a Luke 1. 48. Non æquanda est mulieribus cunctis, quæ genuit majestatem. Author lib. de singular. Cliricorum. † Helisaber & Zacharias nos docere possunt quanto inferiores sunt B. Ma-

rix matri Domini sanctitate, quæ conscia in se habitantis Dei libere proclamat, Ecce ergo ex hoc beatam me dicent omnes generationes. S. Hier. adv. Pelag. l. 1.

* Absit ut quisquam S. Mariam divinæ gratiæ privilegiis ut speciali gloriâ fraudare conetur. † H. Mæia εν πηγῇ, ο Κύριος σεσωσμένος. Εν πηγῇ ἔσω Mæia, ο ὅ Πατρις, καὶ ὁ Υἱός, καὶ ἄγνος Πρεσβύτερος. Τὴν Mæiam ὑποδὶς σεσωσμένον. Epiph. Hæres. 79. Εἰ καλίστη ἡ Mæia, καὶ ἁγία, καὶ τεκνοποιήσασα, ἀλλ' ἐκείνη ἐστὶν ἡ σεσωσμένη. ib. Ἡμεῖς δὲ τὸ θεογονῶν θεολογούμεν ὅτι ἐν τῇ ἀνθρώπων τῷ ἐν ἀρετῇ διασφαιλῶντος αἰς ἀνθρώπων αἰῶνος γενεαί γε μὴν ὅτι τὸ ὅλων σεσωσμένον εἶναι καὶ πατέρα, καὶ τὸ ἐκόντα γενεῶν, καὶ τὸ πατέρα ἀποδοῦναι. Theod. Therapeut. 2. p. 302.

In respect of him it was necessary, first, that we might be assured he was made, or begotten, of a woman, and consequently that he had from her the true nature of man. For he took not on him the nature of Angels, and therefore saved none of them who, for want of a Redeemer, are reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day. And man once fallen had been, as deservedly, so irrevocably, condemned to the same condition, but that he took upon him the seed of Abraham. For being we are partakers of flesh and blood, we could expect no Redemption but by him who likewise took part of the same. We could look for no Redeemer, but such a one who by consanguinity was our † Brother. And being there is but one Mediatour between God and man, the man *Christ Jesus*, we cannot be assured that he was the *Christ*, or is our *Jesus*, except we be first assured that he was a Man. Thus our Redeemer, the Man *Christ Jesus*, was born of a woman, that he might * redeem both men and women; that both sexes might rely upon him, who was of the one, and from the other.

Heb. 2. 16.

Heb. 2. 14.

† under that notion did the ancient Jews expect him, as appeareth by the Targum, Cantic. 3. 1.

וְכִהְיֶה
יְמֵינוּ
אֶתְּנוּ
מִלֵּכָה
מִשִּׁיחָה
לִכְנֵי שְׂתָה
דִּישְׂרָאֵל
וְיִסְרוּ
לִוְיָהּ בְּנֵי
יִשְׂרָאֵל
אֶתְּנָה
חַתָּה
עִמָּנוּ
לְאַחַר

When the Messiah shall reveal himself, the sons of Israel shall say unto

him, Thou shalt be unto us a Brother.

* Hominis liberatio in utroque sexu debuit apparere. Ergo, quia virum oportebat suscipere, qui sexus honorabilior est, conveniens erat ut foeminei sexus liberatio hinc appareret, quod ille vir de foemina natus est. S. Aug. Quest. l. 83. Nolite vos ipsos contemnere, viri, filius Dei virum suscepit: nolite vos ipsas contemnere, foeminae, filius Dei natus ex foemina est. Idem de Agone Christi. † Heb. 4. 15. Non cum in peccatis mater ejus in utero aluit, quem Virgo concepit, Virgo peperit. S. Augustin. Tract. 4. in Johan. Ergo ecce Agnus Dei. Non habeat iste traducem de Adam; carnem tantum sumpsit de Adam, peccatum non assumpsit. Ibid. Verbum caro factum in Similitudine carnis peccata omnia nostra suscepit, nullum reatus vitium ferens ex traduce prævaricationis exortum. Joann. 4. Epist. ad Constantinum.

† Levi in lumbis Abraham

Abrahæ fuit secundum concupiscentiam carnalem, Christus autem secundum solam substantiam corporalem. Cum enim sit in semine & visibilis corpulentia & invisibilis ratio, utrumque cucurrit ex Abraham, vel etiam ex ipso Adam, usque ad corpus Mariæ, quia & ipsum eo modo conceptum & exortum est: Christus autem visibilem carnis substantiam de carne Virginis sumpsit; ratio vero conceptionis ejus non à semine virili, sed longe aliter ac desuper venit. S. August. de Gen. ad lit. l. 10. c. 19.

Melchizedec: so though we being in the loins of *Adam* may be all said to sin in him; yet *Christ*, who descended from the same *Adam* according to the flesh, was not partaker of that sin, but an expiation for it. For he which is contained in the seminal virtue of his Parent is some way under his natural power, and therefore may be in some manner concerned in his actions: but he who is onely from him by his natural substance, according to a passive or obediential power, and so receiveth not his propagation from him, cannot be so included in him as to be obliged by his actions, or obnoxious to his demerits.

Thirdly, it was necessary that we should believe *Christ* born of that person, that Virgin *Mary* which was espoused unto *Joseph*, that thereby we might be assured that he was of the family of *David*. For whatsoever Promises were made of the *Messias* were appropriated unto him. As the seed of the woman was first contracted to the seed of *Abraham*, so the seed of *Abraham* was next appropriated to the son of *David*. He was to be called the son of the Highest, and the Lord God was to give unto him the throne of his father *David*. When *Jesus* asked the Pharisees, *What think ye of Christ? whose son is he?* they said unto him, *The son of David*. When *Herod* demanded of the chief Priests and Scribes where *Christ* should be born; they said unto him, *In Bethlehem of Judæa*, because that was the city of *David*, whither *Joseph* went up with *Mary* his espoused wife, because he was of the house and lineage of *David*. After *John* the Baptist, the forerunner of *Christ*, was born, *Zacharias* blessed the Lord God of Israel, who had raised up an horn of salvation for us in the house of his servant *David*. The woman of Canaan, the blind men sitting by the way, and those other blind that followed him, cried out, *Have mercy on us, O Lord, thou son of David*. The very children out of whose mouths God perfected praise were crying in the Temple, and saying, *Hosannah to the son of David*. And when the blind and dumb both spake and saw, all the people were amazed, and said, *Is not this the son of David?* Thus by the publick and concurrent testimonies of all the Jews, the promised *Messias* was to come of the house and lineage of *David*; † for God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins according to the flesh he would raise up *Christ* to sit upon his throne. It was therefore necessary we should believe that our Saviour was made of the seed of *David* according to the flesh: of which we are assured, because he was born of that Virgin *Mary* who descended from him, and was espoused unto *Joseph*, who descended from the same, that thereby his genealogie might be known.

† Acts 2. 30.
Atquin hinc
magis Chri-
stum intelli-
gere debebis
ex David de-
putatum car-
nali genere,
ob Mariæ
Virginis cen-
sam. De hoc
enim promif-
so juratur in
Psalmo ad
David, Ex
fructu ventris
tui collocabo
super thronum
suum. Tertull.
l. 3. adv. Mar-
cionem c. 20.

The Consideration of all which will at last lead us to a clear explication of this latter Branch of the Article, whereby every Christian may inform himself what he is bound to profess, and being informed fully express what is the object of his Faith in this particular, when he saith, I believe in *Jesus Christ* which was born of the Virgin *Mary*. For hereby he is conceived to intend thus much: I assent unto this as a most certain and infallible truth, That there was a certain woman, known by the name of *Mary*, espoused unto *Joseph* of Nazareth, which before and after her Espousals was a pure and unspotted Virgin, and being and continuing in the same Virginity, did by the immediate operation of the Holy Ghost conceive within her womb the onely-begotten Son of God, and after the natural time of other women brought him forth as her first-born son, continuing still a most pure and immaculate

maculate Virgin; whereby the Saviour of the world was born of a woman under the Law, without the least pretence of any original corruption, that he might deliver us from the guilt of sin; born of that Virgin which was of the house and lineage of *David*, that he might sit upon his throne, and rule for evermore. And in this latitude I profess to believe in *Jesus Christ, born of the Virgin Mary*.

ARTICLE IV.

Suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried.

THIS Article hath also received some accession in the particular expressions of *Christ's* Humiliation. For the first word of it, now generally speaking of his Passion, in the most ancient Creeds was no way distinguished from his Crucifixion; for as we say, *suffered and crucified*, they onely, *† Crucified under Pontius Pilate*: nor was his Crucifixion distinguished from his Death, but where we reade, *crucified, dead, and buried*, they onely, *crucified and buried*. Because the chief of his Sufferings were on the Cross, and he gave up the Ghost there; therefore his whole Passion and his Death were comprehended in his Crucifixion.

† Crucifixus
sub Pontio
Pilato, & se-
pultus. *Ruffi*
in *Symb. Cas-*
sianus de in-
carn. Domini
Credimus in
eum qui sub
Pontio Pila-

to crucifixus est & sepultus. *S. Augst. de Fide & Symb. & de Trinitat. l. 1. c. 14.* Caput nostrum Christus est, crucifixum & sepultum, resuscitatum ascendit in cœlum. *Idem in Psal. 132.* Qui sub Pontio Pilato crucifixus est & sepultus. *Max. Taurin. Chrysol. Enseb. Gallic. Tōv ἐν Πόντιῳ Πιλάτῳ σταυρωθεῖς, ταφέντα.* Qui sub Pontio Pilato crucifixus est & sepultus. *MSS. Ar-mach. And beside these, a witness without exception, Leo the Great; Unigenitum Filium Dei crucifixum & sepultum, omnes etiam in Symbolo confitemur. Epist. 10. cap. 5.* Afterwards the Passion was expressed: Passus sub Pontio Pilato, crucifixus & sepultus. *Etherius uxam. And the Death: Passus sub Pontio Pilato, crucifixus, mortuus, & sepultus. Author lib. de Symb. ad Catechum.* Not but both these were expressed before in the Rule of Faith by Tertullian, but without particular mention of the Crucifixion. *Adu. Prax. c. 2.* hunc passum, hunc mortuum, & sepultum. as Optatus, Passus, mortuus, & sepultus resurrexit. *l. 1.* Passus, sepultus, & tertia die resurrexit. *Capitul. Caroli 82.* And generally the Ancients did understand determinately his Crucifying by that more comprehensive name of his Suffering. For as Marcellus and S. Cyrill have σταυρωθεῖς καὶ ταφέντα, *Enschins and the Nicene Council to the same purpose have παθόντα onely in their Creeds. As Cl. Alex. Pædag. l. 2. c. 3. τῇ εἰς ὁδὸν ἄσπιν, τῇ εἰς παθόντα διωλογίαν.* Which was further enlarged afterwards by the Council of Constantinople into σταυρωθεῖς, καὶ παθόντα, καὶ ταφέντα.

But again, being he suffered not onely on the Cross; being it was possible he might have been affixed to that cursed Tree, and yet not have died; therefore the Church thought fit to adde the rest of his Sufferings, as antecedent, and his Death, as consequent, to his Crucifixion.

To begin then with his Passion in general. In those words, *He suffered under Pontius Pilate*, we are to consider part as Substantial, part as Circumstantial. The Substance of this part of the Article consisteth in our Saviour's Passion, *He suffered*: the Circumstance of Time is added, declared by the present Governour, *under Pontius Pilate*.

Now for the explication of our Saviour's *Passion* as distinct from those particulars which follow in the Article, more I conceive cannot be required then that we shew, *Who* it was that suffered, *How* he suffered, *What* it was he suffered.

First, If we would clearly understand him that suffered in his full relation to his *Passion*, we must consider him both in his Office, and his Person; as *Jesus Christ*, and as the onely-begotten Son of God. In respect of his Office, we believe that he which was the *Christ* did suffer; and so we make profession to be saved by Faith in a suffering *Messias*. Of which that we may give a just account, First, we must prove that the promised *Messias* was to suffer:

This Prediction is so clear, ever since the *Serpent* was to bruise the heel of the woman's seed, that the *Jews*, who were resolved to expect a *Messias* which should be onely glorious, have been enforced to invent another, which should suffer. And then they answer us with a distinction of their own invention; That a *Messias* was to redeem us, and a *Messias* was to suffer for us: but the same *Messias* was not both to redeem us and to suffer for us. For they say that there are † two several persons promised under the name of the *Messias*; one of the Tribe of *Ephraim*, the other of the Tribe of *Judah*; one the son of *Joseph*, the other the son of *David*; the one to precede, fight, and suffer death, the other to follow, conquer, reign, and never to die. If then our Saviour were a *Christ*, we must confess he was a suffering *Messias*, and consequently, according to their doctrine, not a Saviour. For if he were the son of *David*, then, say they, he was never to die; or if he ever died, he was not that *Messias* which was promised to sit upon the throne of *David*. And while we confess our Saviour died, and withall assert his descent from the house of *David*, we do, in their opinion, involve our selves in a Contradiction.

† So indeed the Jews expect a double *Messias*, one משיח בן יוסף *Messias* the son of *Joseph*, the other משיח בן דוד *Messias* the son of *David*. So the Targum expressly upon Canticles 4. 5.

תרין פריקים דעתירין למפריק משיח בר דוד ומשיח בר אפרים Two are thy Deliverers which shall deliver thee, *Messias* the son of *David*, and *Messias* the son of *Ephraim*: and in the same manner, Chap. 7. 3. This that Paraphrast, nothing so ancient as the rest, is conceived to have taken out of the Talmud in Massebeth Succa; where cap. 5. is inscribed דחלין שאל מה אתה מבקש. Ask what thou wilt, (according to the second Psalm) God saith to *Messias* the son of *David*, שאל מה אתה מבקש. Ask what thou wilt, (according to the second Psalm) and I will give it thee. כיון שרואה למשיח בן יוסף שנהרג. Who seeing *Messias* the son of *Joseph* which was slain, asked of God nothing but life. Thus from the Talmud and the later Targum the Rabbins have generally taught a double *Messias*, one the son of *David*, the other of *Joseph*. As Solomon Jarchi, Isa. 24. 18. Zech. 12. 10. Aben Ezra Zach. 9. 9. Malach. 3. 1. Kimchi Zach. 12. 10. whom the later Jews constantly follow. And this Marcion the Heretick seems to have learned of the Jews, and to have taught with some alteration in favour of his own opinion. Constituit Marcion alium esse Christum, qui Tiberianis temporibus à Deo quondam ignoto revelatus sit in salutem omnium gentium; alium, qui à Deo creatore in resurrectionem Judaici status sit destinatus, quandoque venturus. Tertul. adv. Marcion. lib. 4. cap. 6.

But this Distinction of a double *Messias* is far from prevailing over our belief: first, because it is in it self false, and therefore of no validity against us; secondly, because it was first invented to counterfeit the truth, and so very advantageous to us.

That it is in it self false, will appear, because the Scriptures never mention any *Messias* of the Tribe of *Ephraim*; neither was there ever any promise of that nature made to any of the sons or off-spring of *Joseph*. Beside, as we acknowledge but one Mediatour between God and man, so the Scriptures never mention any *Messias* but one. Under whatsoever title he is represented to us, there can be no pretence for a double person. Whether the seed of the woman, or the seed of *Abraham*, whether *Shiloh*, or the Son of *David*, still one person promised: and the style of the ancient Jews before our Saviour was, not they, but he † which is to come. The question which was asked him, when he professed himself to be *Christ*, was, whether it was he which was to come, or whether they were to look for another; not that they could look for him and for another also. The objection then was, that *Elias* was not yet come, and therefore they expected no *Messias* till *Elias* came.. Nor can the difference of the *Messiah's* condition be any true reason of imagining a double person, because in the same place the Prophets, speaking of the same person, indifferently represent him in either condition. Being then, by the confession of all the Jews, one *Messias* was to be the son of *David*, whom *Elias* was to precede; being by the tenure of the Scriptures there was never promise made of more *Christs* than one, and never the least mention of the Tribe of *Ephraim* with any such relation; it followeth that that distinction is in it self false.

Again, that the same Distinction, framed and contrived against us, must needs

Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles and the people of Israel, were gathered together; For to doe whatsoever thy hand and thy counsel determined before to be done. For as when the two Goats were presented before the Lord, that Goat was to be offered for a Sin-offering upon which the lot of the Lord should fall; and that lot of the Lord was lift up on high in the hand of the High-priest, and then laid upon the head of the Goat which was to die: so the hand of God is said to have determined what should be done unto our Saviour, whose Passion was typified by that Sin-offering. And well may we say that the hand of God as well as his counsel determined his Passion, because he was delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God. Lv. 16.8.

And this determination of God's counsel was thus made upon a Covenant or Agreement between the Father and the Son, in which it was concluded by them both what he should suffer, what he should receive. For beside the Covenant made by God with man, confirmed by the blood of *Christ*, we must consider and acknowledge another Covenant from eternity made by the Father with the Son: which partly is expressed, *If he shall make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days;* partly by the Apostle, *Then said I, Loe, I come, (in the volume of the book it is written of me) to doe thy will, O God.* In the Condition of making his soul an offering for sin, we see propounded whatsoever he suffered; in the acceptance, *Loe, I come to doe thy will, O God,* we see undertaken whatsoever was propounded. The determination therefore of our Saviour's Passion was made by Covenant of the Father who sent, and the Son who suffered. Acts 2.23.

And as the Sufferings of the *Messias* were thus agreed on by consent, and determined by the counsel of God; so they were revealed by the Spirit of God unto the Prophets, and by them delivered to the Church; they were involved in the Types, and acted in the Sacrifices. Whether therefore we consider the Prophecies spoken by God in the mouths of men, they clearly relate unto his Sufferings by proper prediction; or whether we look upon the Ceremonial performances, they exhibit the same by an active representation. S. Paul's Apology was clear, that he said none other things but those which the Prophets and Moses did say should come, That *Christ* should suffer. The Prophets said in expresse terms that the *Messias*, whom they foretold, should suffer: Moses said so in those Ceremonies which were instituted by his Ministry. When he caused the Passeeover to be slain, he said that *Shiloh* was the Lamb slain before the foundations of the world. When he set the brazen Serpent up in the wilderness, he said, the Son of man should be lifted up upon the Cross. When he commanded all the Sacrifices for sin, he said, without effusion of blood there was no Remission, and therefore the Son of God must die for the sins of men. When he appointed Aaron to go into the Holy of holies on the day of Atonement, he said, *Christ* our High-priest should never enter through the veil into the highest Heavens to make expiation for us, but by his own Blood. If then we look upon the fountain, the eternal Counsel of the will of God, if we look upon the Revelation of that counsel, either in expresse Predictions or Ceremonial Representations, we shall clearly see the truth of our third Assertion, that the Sufferings of the Promised *Messias* were predetermined and foretold. 1.53.10.

Now all these Sufferings which were thus agreed, determined and revealed as belonging to the true *Messias*, were undergone by that *Jesus* of Nazareth whom we believe to be the true *Christ*. Never was there any suffering Type which he out-went not, never Prediction of any Passion which he fulfilled not, never any expression of grief and sorrow which he felt not. When the appointed time of his death approached, he said to his Apostles, *Behold, we go up to Jerusalem, and all things that are written by the Prophets concerning* Hb. 10.7.

the Son of man shall be accomplished. When he delivered them the blessed Sacrament, the commemoration of his Death, he said, *Truly the Son of man goeth as it was determined.* After his Resurrection, he chastised the dulness of his Disciples, who were so overwhelmed with his Passion, that they could not look back upon the antecedent Predictions; saying unto them, *O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the Prophets have spoken! Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory?* After his Ascension, S. Peter made this profession before the Jews, who had those Prophecies, and saw his Sufferings; *Those things which God before had shewed by the mouth of all his Prophets, that Christ should suffer, he hath so fulfilled.* Whatsoever therefore was determined by the Counsel of God, whatsoever was revealed by the Prophets, concerning the Sufferings of the *Messias*, was all fulfilled by that *Jesus* whom we believe to be, and worship as, the *Christ*. Which is the fourth and last Assertion propounded to express our Saviour's Passion in relation to his Office.

Luke 22. 22.
καὶ τὸ ὁρί-
σθαι.

Luke 24. 25,
26.

Act. 3. 18.

Having considered him that *suffered* in his Office, we are next to consider him in his Person. And being in all this Article there is no person expressly named or described, we must look back upon the former, till we find his description and his name. The Article immediately preceding leaves us in the same suspension; but for our satisfaction refers us to the former, where we find him named *Jesus*, and described *the onely-begotten Son of God*.

† This is that
inseparabilis
connexio in
the Creed;
which Casti-
anus wreath so
much against
Nestorius, De
Incarn. l. 6.

Now this Son of God we have already shewed to be therefore truly called the *Onely-begotten*, because he was from all eternity generated of the essence of the Father, and therefore is, as the eternall Son, so also the eternall God. Wherefore by the † immediate coherence of the Articles, and necessary consequence of the Creed, it plainly appeareth that the eternall Son of God, God of God, very God of very God, *suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried.* For it was no other person which *suffered under Pontius Pilate* then he which was *born of the Virgin Mary*, he which was *born of the Virgin Mary* was no other person then he which was *conceived by the Holy Ghost*, he which was *conceived by the Holy Ghost* was no other person then *our Lord*, and that *our Lord* no other then the *onely Son of God*: therefore by the immediate coherence of the Articles it followeth, that *the onely Son of God, our Lord, suffered under Pontius Pilate.* That Word which was in the beginning, which then was with God, and was God, in the fulness of time being made flesh did suffer. For the *Princes of this World crucified the Lord of glory*; and *God purchased his Church with his own blood.* That Person which was begotten of the Father before all worlds, and so was really the *Lord of glory*, and most truly *God*, took upon him the nature of Man, and in that nature, being still the same Person which before he was, did suffer. When our Saviour fasted forty days, there was no other person hungry then that Son of God which made the world; when he sat down weary by the Well, there was no other person felt that thirst but he which was eternally begotten of the Father, the fountain of the Deity; when he was buffeted and scourged, there was no other person sensible of those pains then that eternall Word which before all worlds was impassible; when he was crucified and died, there was no other person which gave up the Ghost but the Son of him, and so of the same nature with him, *who onely hath immortality.* And thus we conclude our first Consideration propounded, *viz.* Who it was which suffered; affirming that, in respect of his Office, it was the *Messias*, in respect of his Person, it was God the Son.

1 Cor. 2. 8.
Act. 20. 28.
Dominum
passum Sym-
boli tenet au-
thoritas, &
Apostolus
tradidit, di-
cens, Si enim
cognovissent,
nunquam
Dominum
glorie cruci-
fixissent. Vi-
gil. adv.
Euseb. l. 2.

But the perfect probation and illustration of this truth requireth first a view of the second Particular propounded, *How, or, In what, he suffered.* For while

while we prove the Person suffering to be God, we may seem to deny the Passion, of which the perfection of the Godhead is incapable. The Divine nature is of infinite and eternall happiness, never to be disturbed by the least degree of infelicity, and therefore subject to no sense of misery. Wherefore while we profess that the Son of God did suffer for us, we must so far explain our Assertion, as to deny that the Divine nature of our Saviour suffered. For being the Divine nature of the Son is common to the Father and the Spirit, if that had been the subject of his Passion, then must the Father and the Spirit have suffered. Wherefore as we ascribe the Passion to the Son alone, so must we attribute it to that Nature which is his alone, that is, the humane. And then neither the Father nor the Spirit will appear to suffer, because neither the Father nor the Spirit, but the Son alone, is Man, and so capable of Suffering.

Whereas then the Humanity of *Christ* consisteth of a Soul and Body, these were the proper subject of his Passion; nor could he suffer any thing but in both or either of these two. For as the *Word was made flesh*, though the Word was † never made, (as being in the beginning God) but the flesh, that is, the Humanity, was made, and the Word assuming it became flesh; so saith S. Peter, *Christ suffered for us in the flesh*, in that nature of man which he took upon him: and so God the Son did suffer, not in that nature in which he was begotten of the Father before all worlds, but in that flesh which by his Incarnation he became. For he was ^b put to death in the flesh, but quickened in the spirit; suffered in the weakness of his Humanity, but rose by the power of his Divinity. As he was made of the seed of David according to the flesh, in the language of S. Paul; so was he put to death in the flesh, in the language of S. Peter: and as he was declared to be the son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness; so was he quickened by the Spirit. Thus the proper Subject and recipient of our Saviour's Passion, which he underwent for us, was that Nature which he took from us.

Far be it therefore from us to think that the Deity, which is immutable, could suffer; which onely hath immortality, could die. The conjunction with Humanity could put no imperfection upon the Divinity: nor can that † infinite nature by any externall acquisition be any way changed in its intrinsic and essential perfections. * If the bright raies of the Sun are thought to insinuate into the most noisome bodies without any pollution of themselves, how can that spiritual essence contract the least infirmity by any union with Humanity? We must neither harbour so low an estimation of the Divine nature, as to conceive it capable of any diminution; nor so mean esteem of the essence of the Word, as to imagine it subject to the sufferings of the flesh he took; nor yet so groundless an estimation of the great mystery of the Incarnation, as to make the properties of one nature mix in confusion with the other. These were the wild collections of the *Arian* and *Apollinarian* Hereticks, whom the Church hath long since silenced by a sound and sober Assertion, that all the Sufferings of our Mediatour were subjected in his humane nature.

Pedag. l. 1. c. 5. 91. C.

† Τὸ δὲ φύσει ἀθάνατον καὶ ἀναλλοίωτον αἰὶ πᾶν τὸν ἔχειν, ἢ ἑωυτοῦ αὐτὸν τῇ ταπεινῇ φύσει, ὅταν ἐν ἐκείνῃ κατ' οἰκονομίαν ᾖ. Greg. Nyss. Epist.

* "Οὐκ ἐστὶν ἡλιακὸς φῶς διδοῦν πᾶσι τοῖς ἀλλήλοις τὰ πάντα πληρῶσαι, καὶ ἑωυτοῦ κενῶν καὶ ἑωυτοῦ ἐραποθέμενος πολὺ πλεον ἢ ἀπώμαλτον· οὐδ' οὕτως δυνάμενος ἔσθ' ἀνὰ πάντας τοὺς αἰῶνες, ἐὰν βλαστῇ ἡ ἀπώμαλτος ἀπώμαλτος ἐκ παλαιότητος. Euseb. Demon. Evang. l. 4. c. 13.

¶ This danger is the rather to be unfolded, because it is not generally understood. The Heresie of Arius, as it was condemned by the Council of Nice, is known to all. But that he made the nature of the Word to suffer in the flesh, is not so frequently or plainly delivered. This Phaedrius (the first of the Latine Church who wrote against the Arians) chargeth them with. Duplicem hunc statum, non conjunctum, sed confusum, vultis videri; ut etiam unius vestrum, id est Epistola Potami, quæ ad Orientem & Occidentem transmissa est, qua asserit, carne & spiritu Christi coagulatis per sanguinem Mariæ, & in unum corpus redactis, passibilem Deum factum. Hoc ideo, ne quis illum ex eo crederet, quem impassibilem satis constat. Lib. adv. Arianos, c. 7. And again: Non ergo est spiritus caro, nec caro spiritus, quod isti volunt egregii Doctores, ut factus sit scilicet Dominus & Deus noster ex hac substantiarum permutatione passibilis. Ideo autem passibilem volunt dici, ne ex impassibili credatur. Cap. 8. Ματθ. ἐν Ἀγανατοὶ παλαιῶν. (ἀρχα

B b 2

† ὁ λόγος
οὐκ ἐστὶν ἡλιακὸς
φῶς διδοῦν
πᾶσι τοῖς ἀλλήλοις
τὰ πάντα πληρῶσαι,
καὶ ἑωυτοῦ κενῶν
καὶ ἑωυτοῦ ἐραποθέμενος
πολὺ πλεον ἢ ἀπώμαλτον·
οὐδ' οὕτως δυνάμενος
ἔσθ' ἀνὰ πάντας
τοὺς αἰῶνες, ἐὰν
βλαστῇ ἡ ἀπώμαλτος
ἀπώμαλτος ἐκ παλαιότητος.
Euseb. Demon. Evang.
S. Athan. de
Incarn.

* 1 Pet. 4. 1.

† 1 Pet. 3. 18.

Adeo salva est
uriusq; pro-
prietas sub-
stantiæ, ut
& Spiritus
res suas ege-
rit in illo, id
est, virtutes
& opera &
signa, & caro
passiones suas
suncta sit, e-
suriens sub
Diabolo, fi-
tiens sub Sa-
maritide,
frens Laza-
rum, anxia
usque ad mor-
tem, denique
& mortua est.
Tertul. adv.
Prax. c. 27.
Clem. Alex.

Calixtus solutus ἡσαν δὲ τῶν ἀντιπρὸς αὐτὸν ὁμολογῶντων ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς ὁμοούσιος τῷ Υἱῷ, καὶ ὁ Υἱὸς ὁμοούσιος τῷ Πατρὶ, καὶ ὁ Ἅγιος Πνεῦμα ὁμοούσιος τοῖς ἄλλοις. S. Hilary, *lib. de Trinitate*. Of this S. Hilary is to be understood: Sed eorum omnis hic sensus, ut opinentur metum mortis in Dei Filium incidisse, qui afferunt non de eternitate prolatum, neque de infinitate paternæ substantiæ existitisse, sed ex nullo illum qui omnia creavit effectum; ut assumptum ex nihilo sit, & ceptum ex opere, & confirmatum ex tempore. Et ideo in eo doloris anxietas, ideo spiritus passio cum corporis passione. *Can. 31. in Mat.* *Ubi* he clearly he argues against the Arians. The right understanding whereof is the only true way to reconcile those harsh sayings of his which so troubled the Master of the Sentences, and the whole Schools ever since.

And now the onely difficulty will consist in this, how we can reconcile the Person suffering with the Subject of his Passion; how we can say that God did suffer, when we profess the Godhead suffered not. But this seeming difficulty will admit an easie solution, if we consider the intimate conjunction of the Divine and humane nature, and their union in the person of the Son. For † hereby those Attributes which properly belong unto the one are given to the other; and that upon good reason. For being the same individual person is by the conjunction of the nature of God and the nature of man really and truly both God and man; it necessarily followeth, that it is true to say, *God is man*, and as true, *A man is God*: because in this particular he which is man is God, and he which is God is man. Again, being by reason of the Incarnation it is proper to say, *God is man*, it followeth unavoidably, that whatsoever necessarily belongeth to the humane nature may be spoken of God; otherwise there would be a man to whom the nature of man did not belong, which were a contradiction. And being by virtue of the same Incarnation it is also proper to say, *A man is God*, by the same necessity of consequence we must acknowledge, that all the essential Attributes of the Divine nature may truly be spoken of that man; otherwise there would be one truly and properly God to whom the nature of God did not belong, which is a clear repugnancie. Again, if the properties of the Divine nature may be truly attributed to that man which is God, then may those actions which flow from those properties be attributed to the same. And being the properties of the humane nature may be also attributed to the eternall Son of God, those actions or passions which did proceed from those properties may be attributed to the same Son of God, or God the Son. Wherefore as God the Son is truly man, and as man truly passible and mortal; so God the Son did truly suffer, and did truly die. And this is the onely true * communication of properties.

Not that the essential properties of one Nature are really communicated to the other Nature, as if the Divinity of *Christ* were passible and mortal, or his Humanity of original Omnipotence and Omnipresence; but because the same God the Son was also the Son of man, he was at the same time both mortal and eternall: mortal, as the son of man, in respect of his Humanity; eternall, as the Son of God, in respect of his Divinity. The Sufferings therefore of the *Messias* were the Sufferings of God the Son: not that they were the Sufferings of his Deity, as of which that was incapable; but the Sufferings of his Humanity, as unto which that was inclinable. For although the humane nature was conjoynd to the Divine, yet it suffered as much as if it had been alone; and the Divine as little suffered as if it had not been conjoynd: because each kept their respective Properties distinct, without the least confusion in their most intimate conjunction. From whence at last the Person suffering is reconciled to the Subject of his Passion: For God the Son being not onely God, but also Man, suffered, though not in his Deity, by reason of which he is truly God, yet in his Humanity, by which he who is truly God is as truly Man. And thus we conclude our two first Disquisitions: Who it was that suffered; in respect of his Office, the *Messias*, in respect of his Person, God the Son: How it was he suffered; not in his Deity, which

† Per indubitanem u-
nitatem Verbi & carnis,
omnia quæ carnis sunt
aleribuntur & Verbo,
quomodo & quæ Verbi
sunt prædicantur in
carne. *Orig.*
in Epist. ad Rom.
Διὰ τὴν αὐ-
τὴν ἐνότητα
ὁ θεὸς προσλη-
φθεὶς τῶν σα-
ρκὸς καὶ τῆς
προσλαμβο-
μῆς σαρκὸς
τοῦ ἀληθι-
νοῦ ταύτης ὡς
καὶ τὸ ἀληθὲς
πνεῦμα
θεοῦ, καὶ τὸ
ἀληθὲς πνεῦ-
μα τοῦ θεοῦ
καὶ τοῦ
ἱεροῦ. *Aug.*
Epist. ad
Thomam. Χρη-
ματίζονται ἐν
ἐκείνῳ ὡς ἐν
ἐκείνῳ πνεύ-
ματι τὸ ὁμοί-
ατον. *Dias-*

3. Called by
the Schools
ordinarily
Communicatio
idiomaticum, by the
ancient Greek
Divines 'Av-
ρισμός, and
sometimes
'Αντιστάσι-
ς.

is impassible, but in his Humanity, which he assumed clothed with our infirmities.

Our next enquiry is, What this God the Son did suffer as the Son of man; not in the latitude of all his Sufferings, but so far as they are comprehended in this Article: which first prescindeth all the antecedent part by the expression of time, *under Pontius Pilate*, who was not Governour of *Judea* long before our Saviour's Baptism; and then takes off his concluding Passion, by adding his Crucifixion and his Death. Looking then upon the Sufferings of our Saviour in the time of his preaching the Gospel, and especially before his death, we shall best understand them by considering them in relation to the Subject or recipient of them. And being we have already shewed his Passion was wholly subjected in his humane nature, being that nature consisteth of two parts, the Soul and Body; it will be necessary to declare what he suffered in the Body, what in the Soul.

For the first, As we believe the Son of God took upon him the nature of Man, of which the Body is a part; so we acknowledge that he took a true and real Body, so as to become flesh of our flesh, bone of our bone. This Body of *Christ*, really and truly humane, was also frail and mortal, as being accompanied with all those natural properties which necessarily flow from the condition of a frail and mortal body: and though now the same body, exalted above the highest Heavens, by virtue of its glorification be put beyond all possibility of Passion; yet in the time of his Humiliation it was clothed with no such glorious perfection; but as it was subject unto, so it felt, weariness, hunger and thirst. Nor was it onely liable to those internall weakneses and natural infirmities, but to all outward injuries and violent impressions. As all our corporal pain consists in that sense which ariseth from the solution of that continuity which is connatural to the parts of our body; so no parts of his sacred body were injuriously violated by any outward impression, but he was truly and fully sensible of the pain arising from that violation. Deep was that sense and grievous was that pain which those Scourges produced, *when the plowers plowed upon his back, and made long their furrows*: the dilaceration of those nervous parts created a most sharp and dolorous sensation. The coronary Thorns did not onely express the scorn of the imposers, by that figure into which they were contrived; but did also pierce his tender and sacred temples to a multiplicity of pains, by their numerous acuminations. That Spear directed by an impertinent malice which opened his side, though it brought forth water and bloud, caused no dolorous sensation, because the body was then dead: but the Nails which pierced his hands and feet made another kind of impression, while it was yet alive and highly sensible. Thus did the Body of the Son of man truly *suffer* the bitterness of coporal pains and torments inflicted by violent externall impressions.

And as our Saviour took upon him both parts of the nature of man, so he suffered in them both, that he might be a Saviour of the whole. In what sense the Soul is capable of suffering, in that he was subject to animal Passion. Evil apprehended to come tormented his Soul with Fear, which was as truly in him in respect of what he was to suffer, as Hope in reference to the recompence of a reward to come after and for his Sufferings. Evil apprehended as present tormented the same with Sadness, Sorrow and Anguish of mind. So that he was truly represented to us by the Prophet, as a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief; and the proper subject of that Grief he hath fully expressed who alone felt it, saying unto his Disciples, *My soul is exceeding sorrowfull, even unto death.*

Qui suscepit animam, suscepit animæ passionem.
S. Ambros. de Fide l. 2. c. 3.

1/a. 53. 3.

Matt. 26. 38.

lips or eyes; the innumerable pores of all his body must give a passage to more lively representations of the bitter anguish of his Soul: and therefore while he *prayed more earnestly*, in that agony *his sweat was as it were great drops of blood falling down to the ground*. As the Psalmist had before declared; *I am poured out like water, and all my bones are out of joint: my heart is like wax, it is melted in the midst of my bowels*. The heart of our Saviour was as it were melted with fear and astonishment, and all the parts of his body at the same time inflamed with anguish and agony: well then might that melting produce a Sweat, and that inflamed and rarified blood force a passage through the numerous pores.

Psal. 22. 14.

And as the Evangelists expressions, so the Occasion, of the Grief will manifest the height and bitterness thereof. For God *laid on his own Son the iniquities of us all*; and as we are obliged to be sorry for our particular Sins, so was he grieved for the Sins of us all. If then we consider the perfection and latitude of his Knowledge; he understood all the sins of men for which he suffered, all the evil and the guilt, all the offence against the Majesty, and ingratitude against the Goodness, of God, which was contained in all those sins. If we look upon his absolute Conformity to the will of God; he was inflamed with most ardent Love, he was most zealous of his Glory, and most studious to preserve that Right which was so highly violated by those sins. If we look upon his Relation to the sons of men; he loved them all far more than any did themselves, he knew those sins were of themselves sufficient to bring eternall destruction on their Souls and bodies, he considered them whom he so much loved as lying under the wrath of God whom he so truly worshipped. If we reflect upon those Graces which were without measure diffused through his Soul, and caused him with the greatest habitual detestation to abhor all sin: If we consider all these circumstances, we cannot wonder at that Grief and Sorrow. For if the true Contrition of one single sinner, bleeding under the sting of the Law onely for his own iniquities, all which notwithstanding he knoweth not, cannot be performed without great bitterness of Sorrow and remorse; what bounds can we set unto that Grief, what measures to that Anguish, which proceedeth from a full apprehension of all the transgressions of so many millions of sinners?

Adde unto all these present apprehensions, the immediate hand of God pressing upon him all this load, laying on his shoulders at once an heap of all the Sorrows which can happen unto any of the Saints of God; that he, being *touched with the feeling of our infirmities*, might become a *mercifull High-priest*, able and willing to *succour them that are tempted*. Thus may we behold and see if there be any sorrow like unto that sorrow which was done unto him, wherewith the Lord afflicted him in the day of his fierce anger. And from hence we may and must conclude, that the Saviour of man, as he took the whole Nature of man, so he suffered in whatsoever he took: in his Body, by internall Infirmities and externall Injuries; in his Soul, by Fears and Sorrows, by unknown and inexpressible Anguishes. Which shews us fully, (if it can be shewn) the third Particular propounded, What our Saviour suffered.

*Heb. 2. 17, 18.
4. 15.
Lam. 1. 12.*

That our Saviour did thus *suffer*, is most necessary to believe. First, that thereby we may be assured of the verity of his Humane nature. For if he were not Man, then could not Man be redeemed by him; and if that nature in which he appeared were not truly humane, then could he not be truly Man. But we may be well assured that he took on him our nature, when we see him subject unto our infirmities. We know the Godhead is of infinite perfection, and therefore is exalted far above all possibility of molestation.

When

When therefore we see our Saviour truly suffer, we know his Divine essence suffered not, and thence acknowledge the addition of his Humane nature, as the proper subject of his Passion. And from hence we may infallibly conclude, Surely that Mediatour between God and Man was truly Man, as we are men, who when he fasted was an hungry, when he travelled was thirsty and weary as we are, who being grieved wept, being in an agony sweat, being scourged bled, and being crucified died.

Secondly, it was necessary *Christ* should suffer for the Redemption of lapsed men, and their reconciliation unto God; which was not otherwise to be performed then by a plenary satisfaction to his will. He therefore was by all his Sufferings made an Expiation, Atonement and Propitiation for all our sins. For Salvation is impossible unto sinners without Remission of sin; and Remission in the decree of God impossible without effusion of blood. Our Redemption therefore could not be wrought but by the blood of the Redeemer, but by a Lamb slain, but by a suffering Saviour.

Psa. 110. 7.

Luk. 24. 26.

Thirdly, it behoved *Christ* to suffer, that he might purchase thereby eternall Happiness in the Heavens both for himself the Head, and for the members of his Body. *He drunk of the brook in the way, therefore hath he lift up his head.* Ought not *Christ* to suffer, and so to enter into his own glory? And doth he not by the same right by which he entered into it, confer that glory upon us? The recompence of the reward was set before him, and through an intuition of it he chearfully underwent whatsoever was laid upon him. He must therefore necessarily suffer to obtain that Happiness, who is therefore happy because he suffered.

Fourthly, it was necessary *Christ* should suffer, that we might be assured that he is truly affected with a most tender compassion of our afflictions. For this end was he subjected to Misery, that he might become prone unto Mercy: for this purpose was he made a Sacrifice, that he might be a compassionate High-priest: and therefore was he most unmercifull to himself, that he might be most mercifull unto us.

Fifthly, it was necessary the Son of man should suffer, thereby to shew us that we are to suffer, and to teach us how we are to suffer. For *if these things were done to the green tree, what shall be done to the drie?* Nay, if God spared not his natural, his eternall, his onely-begotten Son; how shall he spare his adopted sons, who are best known to be children because they are chastised, and appear to be in his paternall affection because they lie under his fatherly correction? We are therefore Heirs onely because Coheirs with *Christ*; and we shall be Kings onely because we shall reign together with him. It is a certain and infallible consequence, *If Christ be risen, then shall we also rise*; and we must look for as strong a coherence in this other, *If Christ hath suffered, then must we expect to suffer.* And as he taught the Necessity of, so he left us the Direction in, our Sufferings. Great was the example of *Job*, but far short of absolute perfection: the pattern beyond all exception is alone our Saviour, who hath taught us in all our afflictions the exercise of admirable Humility, perfect Patience, and absolute Submission unto the will of God.

And now we may perceive the full importance of this part of the Article, and every Christian may thereby understand what he is to believe, and what he is conceived to profess, when he makes this confession of his Faith, *He suffered.* For hereby every one is obliged to intend thus much: I am really persuaded within my self, and do make a sincere profession of this as a most necessary, certain and infallible truth, That the onely-begotten Son of God, begotten of the Father, and of the same essence with the Father, did for the Re-

Redemption of mankind really and truly suffer ; not in his Divinity , which was impassible, but in his Humanity , which in the days of his Humiliation was subject unto our Infirmities : That as he is a perfect Redeemer of the whole man, so he was a complete Sufferer in the whole ; in his Body, by such dolorous Infirmities as arise internally from humane frailties, and by such Pains as are inflicted by externall injuries ; in his Soul, by fearfull Apprehensions, by unknown Sorrows, by Anguish unexpressible. And in this latitude and propriety I believe our Saviour *suffered*.

UNDER PONTIUS PILATE.

After the substance of this part of the Article, consisting in our Saviour's Passion, *He suffered*, followeth the circumstance of Time, declared by the present Governour, *under Pontius Pilate*. Which, though the name of a stranger to the Commonwealth of *Israel* and the Church of *Christ*, is well preserved to eternall memory in the sacred Articles of our Creed. For as the Son of God by his determinate counsel was sent into the world to die in the fulness of time: so it concerns the Church to be assured of the time in which he died. And because the ancient custome of the world was, to make their Computations by their Governours, and refer their Historical relations to the respective times of their Government: therefore, that we might be properly assured of the Actions of our Saviour which he did, and of his Sufferings, (that is, the Actions which others did to him,) the present Governour is named in that form of speech which is proper to such Historically or Chronologically narrations, when we affirm that he suffered † *under Pontius Pilate*.

† Ἐν Ποντίῳ
Πιλάτῳ.
*Which words
are capable of*

a double construction. First, as they are used by S. Paul, 1 Tim. 6. 13. Ἰνὸς, τῷ μάρτυρησάσῃ ἐπὶ Πορτίῳ Πιλάτῳ τῷ κατὰ ῥωμα-
λογίας, Who before Pontius Pilate testified a good confession; that is, standing before him as before a Judge. As of the same
person, Matt. 28. 14. Καὶ ἐπὶ ἀκροῦν ἦσαν ἐπὶ τοῦ ἡγεμῶνος. If this come to be tried before the Procurator. Thus Festus pro-
nounced it to S. Paul, Acts 25. 9. Δίνας κενεῖν ἐπὶ τῷ ἡμῖν; and S. Paul answered in the same propriety of speech, ἐπὶ τῷ βίμῳ αὐτοῦ.
Καίσαρος ἐγὼς εἰμι. Thus Christ tells his Apostles Mar. 13. 9. ἐπὶ ἡγεμόνων καὶ βασιλέων σταθήσεται. And in this sense ἐπὶ is
often used by the Greeks. Secondly, ἐπὶ Πιλάτῳ is under Pilate, that is, in the time of his Government, when and while he was
Procurator of Judaea: as ἐπὶ ἀρχιερέων Ἀννα καὶ Καϊάφα, Luke 3. 2. and ἐπὶ Ἀλκιβίου τοῦ ἀρχηγέτους, Mar. 2. 26. which is all so
according to the custom and language of the Greeks: As, Κατακλιναίης ἐπὶ Δαυιδίδῃ ἐπὶ ἡλίου, Maym. Armandel. Οὗτος ἦσαν ἐπὶ
τοῦ Λακεδαιμόνιου Ἐξαγαγάντων Τεόνων, Plat. Epist. ad Archytam: and ἐπὶ τούτῳ βασιλευσάσῃ, in this King's reign, is the common
phrase of Pansanias. Thus the Athenians among their 9 Ἀρχοντες had one who was called Ἐπαύνημα, because his name was used
for the denotation of that year; and the phrase was usually, ἐπὶ τῷ θείῳ, or ἐπὶ τῷ θείῳ ἀρχόντῃ: as I find it thrice in one place,
Ὁ δὲ β' (Ἰσοκράτης) ἐπὶ Λυσιστράχῳ Πλάτων δ' ἐπὶ Ἀμεινίῳ γέγονεν, ἐπὶ Ἐπεικλῆϊς ἐπὶ Ἀλκίπῳ. Laert. in Platone. In the same
manner did the Lacedaemonians make their Historicks all accounts by their Ephori, and the Argivi by the Priestesses of Juno: Ἐπὶ Χρυσί-
θῃ ἐπὶ Ἀργεῖ τοις περικλυταῖς Διοτὶ Διολία τῇ ἱεραιόφῃ, καὶ Αἰμοσίῳ ἐφόρῳ ἐν Σαλαμῇ, καὶ Πυθιδόρῳ τῇ Διομυλῶϊ ἀρχόντῃ.
Ἀθλωαίσις. Thucyd. l. 2. And as the Greeks thus referred all actions to the times of these Governours, so did the Jews under the
Roman Government to the Procurators of Judaea; as appeareth by Josephus, who mentioning the first of that Office, Coponius, presently
relates the Insurrection of Judas Galilaeus in this manner: ἐπὶ τούτῳ (Κωπανίῳ) ᾧ ἀντὶ Γαλιλαίας, Ἰδδαί ὄνομα, οὗς ἔσποσαν
ἐν ἡγῆς τοῦ ἐπιχειρεῖν, De Bel. Jud. l. 2. c. 12. then names his successor Ambivius, ἐπὶ Ἐσδωμόνῃ Ἰαμινίαν καλεαίνοντι: after him
Anfuf, ἐπὶ Ἐλίου κατὰ Καίσαρος Antiq. Jud. l. 18. c. 3. And in the same manner in the Creed, παθὼν ἐπὶ Πορτίῳ Πιλάτῳ,
our Saviour suffered under Pontius Pilate, that is, at the time when he was Procurator of Judaea; as Ignatius fully, ἐν ἡμεῶν τῷ
ἡγεμονίᾳ Πορτίῳ Πιλάτῳ, Epist. ad Magasios.

And because he not onely suffered under him as the present Governour, but also was arraigned and condemned by him as a Judge; therefore it will be necessary for the illustration of the manner, and confirmation of the truth, of our Saviour's Sufferings, to declare what hath been left and derived to our knowledge both concerning his Person and his Office.

For the first, we find him described by two-names; nor is any other name of his extant, although, according to the † general custome of the *ROMANS*,^{† Pausanias speaking of the Romans, Telsa}

ἐπὶ τὴν ἑοικύμενα, καὶ ἐπὶ πλεονα ὀνόματα ἐκείνῳ πένοντο. And although Diomedes and Plutarch have observed, that even among the Romans there were some διωνύμια, yet the *Prænomen* was never omitted, as *Priscian* affirmed, Ex illo tempore consuetudo tenuit, ut nemo Romanus sit absque prænominē. lib. 2.

were properly translated by the old Interpreter, procurator Pontio Pilato Judæam. Thus Lucius Dexter ad annum christi 28. Pontius Pilatus procurator Judæe à Tiberio mittitur in Judeam. And Justina Martyr most properly; Τὸν σαυραδίνῃα ἐπὶ Ποσειά Πιλάτου, τὴν ἡρωικὴν ἐν Ἰουδαίᾳ ἐπὶ χέρονσι Τιβέλειον Καίσαρ' ἀποπέμψας. Apolog. 2. And again, speaking to the Emperours, by whom the Procurators were sent; Καὶ Πιλάτῃ τῷ ὑμετέτερι παρ' Ἰουδαίου ὅμοιοις ἀπεπέμψας. And again, κατὰ τὸ νόμον αὐτοῦ τὴν Τιβέλειον βασιλείαν, ἀποπέμψας τὴν Ἰουδαίαν ἐπὶ Τιβέλειον καὶ Σιστίαν Πιλάτων. Hist. l. i. c. 10. And S. Jerome's translation of his Chronicon; Pilatus procurator Judæe à Tiberio mittitur. Thus it appears that Pilate of the Equestrian Order was properly Procurator, as that Office was ordinarily given to men of that Order, as Tacitus testifies; Cn. Julius Agriicola utrumque avum procuratorem Cæsarium habuit, quæ equestris nobilitas est. in vita Jul. Agric. Which is to be understood concerning the Imperial Provinces: for into those which were of the Provinces of the People, the Procurator sent by Cæsar were of the Liberti. For the Emperor sent into all the Provinces his Procurators, but with this difference, as Dio observes; εἰς πάντα ὁμοίως τὰ ἔθνη, τὰ δὲ αὐτῶν καὶ τὰ τῶν ἄλλων τοῦ βίου ἐκ τῆς ἰσότητος, τοὺς δὲ ἐκ τῆς ἀπειροκαρίστου, πλείους. Hist. l. 53. † The Roman Procurator is ordinarily in Greek Ανθύπαρχος by their ἑπίτροπος & as the Glossa Latina-Grec. Procurator, ἐπίτροπος. But yet they are not of the same latitude in their use; Ἐπίτροπος comprehending the notion of Tutor, as well as Procurator. Hesych. Ἐπίτροπος, ὁ σπουδαῖον χαλῶν, καὶ ὅλης τῆς οἰκίας, καὶ ὀφειλῶν. Gloss. Vet. Ἐπίτροπος, Procurator, tutor. Ἐπίτροπος therefore was used by the Greeks in both notions, whereof Procurator of the Latines is but one. And in the language of the Romans he is a Procurator which undertakes to manage the business of another man. Procurator si negotium suscipit, saith Aponius in Divinas. and Sex. Pompeius, Procurator absentis nomine actor sit; he to whom the care of another man's estate or affairs was committed. Gloss. Vet. Ἐπιτάχ, commissum, & Ἐπτολάς, procurator. In correspondence to these Procurators of the affairs and estates of private persons, there were made such as did take care in every Province of the Imperial Revenue: who, in respect of the Person whom they served, were called Procuratores Cæsaris, or Augustales; in respect of the Countrey where they served, were termed Procuratores provinciales. Their Office is best described by Dion Hist. l. 53. Τοὺς ἀποτρόπους, ἢ τοὺς ῥητάς τινες θεοσδοῦς ἐκκλησίαις, καὶ σεσηλαγμένα σφίστην ἀνάγκαστας, νομομαχομέν. We call, says he, these Ἐπίτροποι, that is, Procurators, which receive the publick Revenues, and dispose of them according to the commands received from the Emperour. For they acted in his name, and what was done by them was accounted as done by the Emperour himself. Quæ acta gesta sunt à Procuratore Cæsaris, sic ab eo comprobari ac si à Cæsare gesta essent. Ulpian. l. i. ff. As we read in Tacitus of the Emperour Claudius; Sæpius audita vox Principis, parem vim rerum habendam à Procuratoribus suis judicatarum, ac si ipse statuisset. Annal. l. 12. And in Suetonius; Ut rata essent quæ Procuratores sui in judicando staterent, à Senatu precario exegit. The proper office therefore of the Provincial Procurator was, to receive the Imperial Revenue, and dispose of it as the Emperour commanded, and to all intents and purposes to doe such things as were necessary therunto, with such authority as if the Emperour himself had done them.

such a care and disposal of the Imperial Revenue: which they exercised as inferior and subordinate to the President, always supreme Provincial Officer.

Now *Judea* being made part of a Province of *Syria*, and consequently under the care of the President of that Province, according to this institution, a particular Procurator was assigned unto it for the disposing of the Emperour's Revenue. And because the Nation of the *Jews* were always suspected of a rebellious disposition against the *Roman* State, and the President of *Syria*, who had the power of the Sword, was forced to attend upon the other parts of his Province; therefore the Procurator of *Judea* was furnished with † power of life and death, and so administered all the power of the President, which was, as to the *Jews*, supreme. Which is very observable, as an eminent act of the Providence of God, by which the full power of Judicature in *Judea* was left in the hands of the Resident Procurator.

† This appeareth by Coponius, the first proper Procurator of Judea, who was

brought in by Quirinus Præfes of Syria, when he came to difpofe of the goods of Archelaus, and to reduce Judæa into the form of a Province, and adjoin it to Syria. Of this Coponius Josephus writeth after this manner: Κωνσταντῆς τὸ αὐτοῦ (Κυπριώτης) Συγγαλαμπυ-
πι, τὰ γυμνασίου τῶν Ἰουδαίων, ἡγεμονεύων· Ἰουδαίον τῇ ἐπὶ τῶν ἀξιοῦσα· that being of the Equestrian order, he was sent with
Quirinus to govern the Jews with the supreme power. Antiq. i. 18. c. 1. And yet more expressly as to the time, occasion, and extent of
his power: Τῆς δ' Ἀρχαίου χρόνου εἰς ἐπαρχίαν ἀντιστάσας, ἐπὶ τῶν τοῦ τοῦ βασιλέως τὰς εἰσπρατῶν, Κωνσταντῆς, πρε-
σβυτέρου, μὲν τὸ κλῆρον λαλῶν ἐξ ὧν τὸ Καίσαρος· ἐξ ὧν αὐτοῦ. Id. de Bel. Jud. l. 2. c. 11. When those parts which were under the com-
mand of Archelaus were reduced into a Province, Coponius was sent thither by the Emperour, and furnished with power of life and
death. For although in the Proconsular Provinces the Procurator of the Emperour had no power but in those things which belonged to
the Exchequer; yet in those Provinces which were properly præfides the Procurator was often loco Præfidis. From whence in the
ancient Inscriptions we read of the same person, Procurator & Præfes Alpium, Procurator & Præfes provinciarum per Orientem,
Procurator & Præfes provincie Sardinie. It was often therefore so that the Procurator did Præfidis partibus fungi: as Ulpian.
l. 8. de officio Proconsulis; In provinciam enim Præsidum provinciarum, nec aliter Procuratori Caesaris hæc cognitio injungitur
quam Præfidis partibus in provincia fungatur. And this is very necessary to be observed, because a Procurator barely such, not armed
with the power of the Præfes provincie, had not the power of the Sword. As Antoninus to Valerius; Procurator meus, qui
vice Præfidis non fungebatur, exilium tibi poenam non potuit irrogare. l. 9. Cod. de penis. And to Heliodorus; Procurator meus,
qui vice Præfidis provinciam non fungitur, sicut exigere poenam desertæ accusationis non potest, ita judicare ut ea inferatur sen-
tentia sua non potest. l. 3. c. ubi causæ. This was plain in the case of Lucilius Capito, Procurator of Asia minor, who was called in
question for exceeding his power, and defended therein by Tiberius. Procurator Asia Lucilius Capito, accusante provincia, causam
dixit magna cum adlevatione Principis, non se jus nisi in servitia & pecuniis familiares dedisse. Quod si vim Prætoris usur-
passet, manifestumque militum usus foret, preta in eo mandata sua, audirent focios. Tacit. Annal. And Dio upon the said example
observes in general, that the Procurators had no such power. Οὐ γὰρ ἐξ ἑωῦ τότε τοῖς τὰ αὐτοκτολῶντα γέμματα διοικῶσι πλείον ὡδὲν
ποῖεν, ἢ τὰς νενομισμένας ἐπεσοδὰς ἐκλήγεον, καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν διαφορῶν ὅν τ' ἐν ἀρχαῖς καὶ τοῖς ῥήμασι ἐκ τῶν τοῖς ἰδιωτοῖς διγὰρ ἐκεί-
νῳ. But although the ordinary Procurators had no other power but to dispose of the Revenue, and determine private causes; yet be which was
vice Præfidis had the power of the Præfes; and such a Procurator was Pontius Pilate in Judæa, as the others who preceded him also were

Mark 14. 64.
Joh. 18. 30,
31.

† I say there-
fore the Jews
answered that
it was not
lawfull for
them to put a-
ny man to
death, because
that power
was taken out
of their hands.
For although
S. Augustine
think they
thought it not
lawfull in re-
spect of the
Passover, In-

telligendum est eos dixisse, non sibi licere interficere quenquam, propter diei festi sanctitatem, quem celebrare jam ceperant, Tract. 14. in Joan. and S. Cyrill be of the same opinion; yet others of the Ancients deliver the true cause why they applied themselves to Pilate to be their want of power; as Ammonius most expressly, Τινος ἔνεχεν αὐτὸν ἐκ ἀνέλου, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τῷ Πιλάτῳ ἦσαν; μάστιγα μὲν τὸ πολὺ τῶν ἀρχῶν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἡ ἐξουσία ἀπετέμνετο, λοιπὸν ὑπὸ Ρωμαίων τῶν στρατῶν κατέκειτο· and upon those words in S. John, ὡς ἐμπιστύντες τῶν ἀρχῶν, ἦσαν γὰρ ὑπὸ Ρωμαίων, ἔπειτα τούτο. So Theophylact, Ἀγνοῦν αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ φεαυτεῖον, ὃ γὰρ ἔχον αὐτοὶ ἐξουσίαν ἀνελεῖν, ἀπὲρ τῶν στρατῶν ὑπὸ Ρωμαίων κατέκειτο· and before him S. Chrysost.

Matt. 27. 18.
Luke 23. 14,
22.

Matt. 27. 19.
Joh. 19. 7, 8.

† So Philo te-
stifies of him:
ὡς γὰρ τιμὴ
φύσιν ἀγα-
μῆς, καὶ μὲν
αὐτὰς ἀ-
μείλιτος.
de Legat. ad
Caum. And
again: Οἱ αὖ
ἐν ἐγκρίτως
ἔχον καὶ βα-
ρύνειν ἀν-
θρώπων.

For by this means it came to pass that *Christ*, who by the determinate coun-
sel of God was to die, and by the prediction of the Prophets was to suffer in
a manner not prescribed by the Law of *Moses*, should be delivered up to a fo-
rein power, and so suffer death after the customes of that Nation to whose
power he was delivered. The malice of the obstinate Jew was high to accuse
and prosecute him, but the power of the Jews was not so high as judicially
to condemn him. For although the chief Priests and the Elders and the
Scribes condemned him guilty of death; yet they could not condemn him to
die, or pronounce the sentence of death upon him, but delivered him up un-
to Pilate: and when he refusing said unto them, *Take ye him, and judge him ac-
cording to your law*; they immediately returned, *It is not lawfull for us to put
any man to death*. The power of life and death was not in any Court of the
Jews, but in the Roman Governour alone as supreme; and † therefore they
answered him, it was not lawfull: not in respect of the Law of *Moses*, which
gave them both sufficient power and absolute command to punish divers of-
fenders with death; but in relation to the Roman Empire, which had taken
all that dominion from them. Forty years before the destruction of *Jerusa-
lem* the Jews themselves acknowledge that they lost their power; which is
sufficient to shew that they had it not when our Saviour suffered: and it is as
true that they lost it twenty years before, at the regulation of *Archelaus*, and
the coming of *Coponius* the Procurator with full power of life and death.
Wherefore our Saviour was delivered unto *Pilate* as the supreme Judge over
the Nation of the Jews, that he might pronounce the sentence of death upon
him.

But how this Judge could be persuaded to an act of so much injustice and
impiety, is not yet easie to be seen. The numerous controversies of the Re-
ligion of the Jews did not concern the Roman Governours, nor were they
moved with the frequent quarrels arising from the different Sects. *Pilate* knew
well it was for envy that the chief Priests delivered him; and when he had ex-
amined him, he found no fault touching those things whereof they accused him.
Three times did he challenge the Nation of the Jews, *Why? what evil hath he
done?* three times did he make that clear profession, *I have found no cause of
death in him*. His own wife, admonished in a dream, sent unto him, saying,
Have thou nothing to doe with that just man; and when he heard that he made
himself the Son of God, he was more afraid: and yet notwithstanding these
apprehensions and professions, he condemned and crucified him.

Here we must look upon the nature and disposition of *Pilate*, which encli-
ned and betrayed him to so foul an Act. He was a man of an † high, rough,
untractable and irreconcilable spirit, as he is described by the Jews, and ap-
peareth from the beginning of his Government, when he brought the Buc-
klers stampt with the pictures of *Cesar* into *Jerusalem*, (which was an abomi-
nation to the Jews,) and could neither be moved by the bloud of many, nor
persuaded by the most humble applications and submiss intreaties of the
whole Nation, to remove them, till he received a sharp reprehension and
severe command from the Emperour *Tiberius*. After that he seized on the
Corban, that sacred Treasury, and spent it upon an Aqueduct: nor could all
their religious and importunate petitions divert his intentions, but his reso-
lution

rator of *Judea*; who, to please the Nation of the *Jews*, did condemn him whom he pronounced innocent, and delivered him, according to the custom of that Empire, and in order to the fulfilling of the Prophecies, to die a painful and shameful death upon the Cross. And thus I believe in *Christ* that suffered under Pontius Pilate.

WAS CRUCIFIED.

FROM the general consideration of our Saviour's Passion, we proceed to the most remarkable particular, his Crucifixion, standing between his Passion, which it concludeth, and his Death, which it introduceth. For the explication whereof it will be necessary, first, to prove that the promised *Messias* was to be crucified, that he which was designed to die for our sins was to suffer upon the Cross; secondly, to shew that our *Jesus*, whom we worship, was certainly and truly crucified, and did suffer whatsoever was foretold upon the Cross; thirdly, to discover what is the nature of Crucifixion, what peculiarities of suffering are contained in dying on the Cross.

That the *Messias* was to be crucified, appeareth both by Types which did apparently foreshew it, and by Prophecies which did plainly foretell it. For though all those Representations and Predictions which the forward † zeal of some ancient Fathers gathered out of the Law and the Prophets cannot be said to signify so much; yet in many Types was the Crucifixion of *Christ* represented, and by some Prophecies foretold. This was the true and unremovable stumbling-block to the *Jews*; nor could they ever be brought to confess the *Messias* should * die that death upon a Tree to which the Curse of the Law belonged: and yet we need no other Oracles then such as are committed to those *Jews* to prove that *Christ* was so to suffer.

† The ancient Fathers following the steps of the Apostles, to prove all the particulars of our Saviour's death out of the Old Testament, have made use of

those Types and Prophecies which did really and truly foreshew it; but together with them, partly out of their own conceptions, partly out of too much credit to the translations, have urged those places which the *Jews* may most easily evade, and we can produce but with small or no pretence. As for the extending of the hands of Moses, they conceive it to be a perfect Type; and Barnabas tells us, the Spirit commanded Moses that he should make the similitude of a Cross; λέγει ὁ εἰς καρδίαν Μωϋσὶ τὸ πνεῦμα, ἵνα ποιῇ τὸν σταυρὸν καὶ τὸ μέγεθος αὐτοῦ. but the Text assures us no more than that Moses held up his hand, which might be without any similitude of a Cross. And when both were lifted up by Aaron and Hur, the representation is not certain. And yet after Barnabas, Justin tells us that Moses represented the Cross, τὸς χεῖρας ἐκτεταγὸς ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ. and Tertullian calls it habitum Crucis. In the same manner with the strange Indian Statue, which is described by Bardisanes as ἀνδρὸς ἰσθμὸς ὁρθός, ἔχων τὰς χεῖρας ἡπλωμένας ἐν τύπῳ σταυροῦ. Porphy. de Styge. with less probability did they gather both the name of *Jesus*, and the Cross of *Christ*, from the 318 servants of Abraham. Ἰδοὺ λέγει, Ἡμεῖς οὖν, ἔχοντες Ἰσοῦν. ἔπ' ὃ σταυρὸς ἐν τῷ Τ. ἡμεῖς ἔχοντες τὸν σταυρὸν, λέγει δὲ τὸν σταυροῦ. Ἰδοὺ ἔν τ' Ἰσοῦν ἐν τοῖς δούλοις ἡμεῶν, καὶ ἐν ἑνὶ τ' σταυρῷ. Epist. Barn. c. 7. As if I stood for *Jesus*, and T for the Cross. And yet Clemens Alex. follows him: φασὶν ἐν τῷ τῷ Κρυπτοῦ σημαίνει τὸν σταυρὸν καὶ τὸ ὄνομα σταυροῦ ὁ σταυρὸς τὸ Ἰσοῦ καὶ τὸ Ἡμεῖς τὸνομα σημαίνει τὸν σταυρὸν. Strom. l. 6. As also S. Ambrose; Nam & Abraham 318 duxit ad bellum, & ex innumeris trophæa hostibus reportavit, signoque Dominice crucis & nominis, &c. Prol. ad l. 1. de Fide. Eos adseiscit quos dignos numero fidelium judicavit, qui in Domini nostri Jesu Christi Passione crederent. Trecentos enim T Græca litera significat; decem & octo autem summum I H exprimit nomen. Id. de Abrah. l. 1. c. 3. And S. Augustine of another 300: Quorum numerus, quia trecenti erant, signum insinuat Crucis, propter literam T Græcam, quia iste numerus significatur. And Clemens Alexandrinus again of the 300 Cubits in the Ark: Ἐστὶ δὲ οἱ τὸν σταυροῦ τῆς ὁμοιοῦς τῷ Κρυπτοῦ σημαίνει λέγουσι. Strom. l. 6. Sed sicut ille non multitudine nec virtute legionum, sed jam tum in Sacramento Crucis, cujus figura per literam Græcam T numero trecentorum exprimitur, adversarios principes debellavit; cujus mysterii virtute trecentis in longum texta cubitis superavit Arca diluvium, ut nunc Ecclesia hoc seculum supernavigat. S. Paulinus Epist. 2. As unlikely a Type did they make Jacob's Ladder. Ego puto Crucem Salvatoris illam esse scalam quam Jacob vidit. Hieron. Scala usque ad cælum attingens Crucis figuram habuit; Dominus innixus scalæ Christus crucifixus ostenditur. Aug. These, and many others, by the writers of the succeeding Ages were produced out of the Old Testament as Types of the Cross, and may in some sense be applied to it being otherwise proved, but prove it not. * Trypho the Jew, in the Dialogue with Justin Martyr, when he had confessed many of the Christian Doctrines, would by no means be brought to this: Εἰ δὲ καὶ ἀπὸς ὅπως σταυρωθῆναι τὸν Χριστὸν, (subaud. Ἰησοῦν) σταυρωθῆναι ὁμολογεῖται. 70. καὶ δὲ σταυρωθῆναι ἐν τῷ νόμῳ λέγει τὸ. ὅτι καὶ οὗτοι οὐκ ἐπίστευσαν ἔχειν. And afterwards, granting his Passion, urges him to prove his Crucifixion; Ἡμεῖς δὲ οὐδὲν εἰς ἔννοιαν ἰσχυρίζομεθα. So Tertullian describes the *Jews*, negantes passionem Crucis in Christum predicant, & argumentantes insuper non esse credendum ut ad id genus mortis exposuerit Deus Filium suum, quod ipse dixit, Maledictus omnis homo qui pependit in ligno. Adv. Judeos c. 10.

A clearer Type can scarce be conceived of the Saviour of the world, in whom all the Nations of the earth were to be blessed, then *Isaac* was: nor

can

Matt. 26. 2.

John 19. 15.

Luke 23. 24.

† That the Souldiers did execute the sentence of death given by the Roman Magistrates in their provinces, and not only in the Camp, is evident out of the Historians of that Nation.

* Matt. 27. 31.

Sciendum est, Romanis Pilatum legibus ministrasse, quibus sancitum est, ut qui crucifigitur prius flagellis verberetur.

S. Hieron. ad

Matt. 27. 27.

Lucian. in Piscatore.

Multi occisi, multi capti, alii verberati crucibus affligi.

Liv. l. 34.

And l. 28.

Ad palum deligatus, lacerato virgis tergo, cervicem cruci Romanæ subijciam.

So Curtius reports of Alexander, Omnes verberibus affectos sub

ipsis radicibus Petræ crucibus iussit affigi.

Thus were the Jews themselves used, who caused our Saviour to be scourged and cruci-

fied: *μαρτυρησας, ὡς ὁμοκαταδικασμένος τῷ Σαβᾶτι πᾶσι αἰνίας, ἀνεστανέντος.* Joseph. excid. l. 5. c. 32.

* Matt. 27. 26.

* John 19. 17.

† This was observed both by Jews and Romans, that their capital punishments were inflicted without

their cities.

And that particularly was observed in the punishment of Crucifixion.

Plautus;

Credo ego isthuc, extemplo tibi

Esse eundum actutum extra urbem dissepis manibus,

Patibulum cum habeas.

Tully; Cum Mamertini more atque instituto suo crucem fixissent post urbem in via Pompeia.

Thieves and

Robbers were usually by the Romans punished with this death.

Thus Caesar used his Pirates, *τὸν ἀγῶνι ἀναστροφῶν.* Plut.

in Vita. Imperator Provinciarum iussit Latrones crucibus affigi.

Petron. Sat. Latronem istum, miserorum pignorum meorum

peremptorem, cruci affigatis.

Apuleius de Aur. Asia. l. 3. Latrocinium fecit aliquis, quid ergo meruit? ut suspenderetur.

Sen. Epist. 7. Where suspendi is as much as crucifigi, and is so to be understood in all Latine Authors which wrote before the days of Con-

stantine. Famosos latrones, in his locis ubi grassati sunt, furcâ figendos compluribus placuit.

Callist. l. 38. de panis. Where fur-

câ figendos is put for crucifigendos, being so altered by Tribonianus, who, because Constantine had taken away the punishment, took also

the name out of the Law.

* Job. 20. 25, 27.

† This was the peculiar Hevise of Basilides, a man so ancient,

that he boasted to follow Glaucias as his Master, who was the Disciple of S. Peter.

And Irenæus hath declared this particularity of

his: Quapropter neque passum eum: & Simonem quendam Cyrenæum angariatum portasse crucem ejus pro eo; & hunc se-

cundum ignorantiam & errorem crucifixum, transfiguratum ab eo, uti putaretur ipse esse Jesus; & ipsum autem Jesum Simonis

accepisse formam, & stantem irrississe eos.

Adv. Hæc. l. 1. c. 23.

And Tertullian of the same Basilides: Hunc (Christum) passum

à Judæis non esse, sed vice ipsius Simonem crucifixum esse: unde nec in eum credendum esse qui sit crucifixus, ne quis confitea-

tur in Simonem credidisse.

De Presc. adv. Hæc. c. 46.

From these is the same delivered by Epiphanius Hæc. 24. and by S. Aug.

Hæc. 4.

It was therefore sufficiently adumbrated by Types, and promulgated by Prophecies, that the promised *Messias* was to be crucified. And it is as certain that our *Jesus*, the *Christ* whom we worship, and from whence we receive that honour to be named *Christians*, was really and truly crucified. It was first the wicked design of *Judas*, who betrayed him to that death: it was the malicious cry of the obdurate *Jews*, *Crucifie him, crucifie him*. He was actually condemned and delivered to that death by *Pilate*, who gave sentence that it should be as they required: he was given into the hands of the Souldiers, the instruments commonly used in inflicting that punishment, who led him away to crucifie him. He underwent those previous pains which customarily antecede that suffering, as * Flagellation, and bearing of the Cross: for ^b *Pilate*, when he had scourged *Jesus*, delivered him to be crucified; ^c and he bearing his Cross went forth into *Golgotha*. They carried him forth out of the city, as by ^d custom in that kind of death they were wont to doe; and there between two Malefactors, . . usually by the *Romans* condemned to that punishment, they crucified him. And that he was truly fastned to the Cross, appears by the satisfaction given to doubting *Thomas*, who said, ^e *Except I shall see in his hands the print of the nails, and put my finger into the print of the nails, I will not believe*: and our Saviour said unto him, *Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands*: whereby he satisfied the Apostle, that he was the *Christ*, and us, that the *Christ* was truly crucified; against that fond ^f Heresie, which made *Simon* the *Cyrenian* not only bear the Cross, but endure Crucifixion, for our Saviour. We therefore infer this second Conclusion from the undoubted testimonies of his followers, and unfeigned confessions of his enemies, That our *Jesus* was certainly and truly crucified, and did really undergoe those Sufferings, which were pre-typified and foretold, upon the Cross.

To which *Lucian* alludes in his own condemnation: *Ἐμὸν δὲ ἀνεσποδομένης δουρί αὐτὸν, ἐν Διᾷ, μαρτυρησάμενος ὡς ὁμοκαταδικασμένος τῷ Σαβᾶτι πᾶσι αἰνίας, ἀνεστανέντος.* Lucian. in Piscatore. Multi occisi, multi capti, alii verberati crucibus affligi. Liv. l. 34. And l. 28. Ad palum deligatus, lacerato virgis tergo, cervicem cruci Romanæ subijciam. So Curtius reports of Alexander, Omnes verberibus affectos sub ipsis radicibus Petræ crucibus iussit affigi. Thus were the Jews themselves used, who caused our Saviour to be scourged and crucified: *μαρτυρησας, ὡς ὁμοκαταδικασμένος τῷ Σαβᾶτι πᾶσι αἰνίας, ἀνεστανέντος.* Joseph. excid. l. 5. c. 32. * Matt. 27. 26.

† This was observed both by Jews and Romans, that their capital punishments were inflicted without their cities. And that particularly was observed in the punishment of Crucifixion. Plautus;

Credo ego isthuc, extemplo tibi
Esse eundum actutum extra urbem dissepis manibus,
Patibulum cum habeas.

Tully; Cum Mamertini more atque instituto suo crucem fixissent post urbem in via Pompeia. Thieves and Robbers were usually by the Romans punished with this death. Thus Caesar used his Pirates, *τὸν ἀγῶνι ἀναστροφῶν.* Plut. in Vita. Imperator Provinciarum iussit Latrones crucibus affigi. Petron. Sat. Latronem istum, miserorum pignorum meorum peremptorem, cruci affigatis. Apuleius de Aur. Asia. l. 3. Latrocinium fecit aliquis, quid ergo meruit? ut suspenderetur. Sen. Epist. 7. Where suspendi is as much as crucifigi, and is so to be understood in all Latine Authors which wrote before the days of Constantine. Famosos latrones, in his locis ubi grassati sunt, furcâ figendos compluribus placuit. Callist. l. 38. de panis. Where furcâ figendos is put for crucifigendos, being so altered by Tribonianus, who, because Constantine had taken away the punishment, took also the name out of the Law.

* Job. 20. 25, 27. † This was the peculiar Hevise of Basilides, a man so ancient, that he boasted to follow Glaucias as his Master, who was the Disciple of S. Peter. And Irenæus hath declared this particularity of his: Quapropter neque passum eum: & Simonem quendam Cyrenæum angariatum portasse crucem ejus pro eo; & hunc secundum ignorantiam & errorem crucifixum, transfiguratum ab eo, uti putaretur ipse esse Jesus; & ipsum autem Jesum Simonis accepisse formam, & stantem irrississe eos. Adv. Hæc. l. 1. c. 23. And Tertullian of the same Basilides: Hunc (Christum) passum à Judæis non esse, sed vice ipsius Simonem crucifixum esse: unde nec in eum credendum esse qui sit crucifixus, ne quis confiteatur in Simonem credidisse. De Presc. adv. Hæc. c. 46. From these is the same delivered by Epiphanius Hæc. 24. and by S. Aug.

Being thus fully assured that the *Messias* was to be, and that our *Christ* was truly, crucified; it thirdly concerns us to understand what was the nature of Crucifixion, what the Particularities of suffering which he endured on the Cross. Nor is this now so easily understood as once it was. For being a *Roman* punishment, it was continued in that Empire while it remained Heathen; but when the Emperours themselves received Christianity, and the towering Eagles resigned the flags unto the Cross, this punishment was

was † forbidden by the supreme Authority, out of a due respect and pious honour to the death of *Christ*. From whence it came to pass, that since it hath been disused universally for so many hundred years, it hath not been so rightly conceived as it was before, when the general practice of the world did so frequently represent it to the Christians eyes. Indeed if the word which is used to denote that punishment did sufficiently represent or express it, it were enough to say that *Christ* was crucified: but being the most usual or * original word doth not of it self declare the Figure of the Tree, or Manner of the Suffering; it will be necessary to represent it by such expressions as we find partly in the Evangelicall relations, partly in such representations as are left us in those Authours whose eyes were daily witnesses of such Executions.

† This is observed by S. Austin, *Serm.* 18. de Verbis Dom. Quia ipse honoratus erat fideles suos in fine hujus seculi, prius honoravit crucem in seculo, ut terrarum principes credentes in eum prohiberent aliquem nocentem

crucifigi. And *Tract.* 36. in *Job*. speaking of this particular punishment; Modo in penis eorum non est apud Romanos ubi enim Domini crux honorata est, putatum est quod & reus honoraretur si crucifigeretur. Whence appears, first, that in the days of S. Austin Crucifixion was disused: secondly, that it was prohibited by the secular Princes. But when it was first prohibited, or by whom, he sheweth not. It is therefore to be observed, that it was first forbidden by the first Christian Emperour, Constantine the Great. Sozomenus gives this relation; Ἀμέλει τοι σπέρτερον νομοθεμήνῃ Ρωμαίσι πῶς τῶ σαρῶ πικρῶν νόμον ἀνέλες τὴν χρίσιν τῆς διδασκαλίας. l. 1. c. 8. * The Original word in the New Testament for the tree on which our Saviour suffered is *σταυρός*, and the action or crucifixion *σταυρῶσις*, the active *σταυρῶν*, and the passive *σταυρῶμεν*. Now *σταυρός*, from which the rest mentioned are manifestly derived, hath of it self originally no other signification then of a stake. As we find it first used by Homer, Ὀδυσ. ε.

Σταυρὸς δ' ἐκ τῶ ἵλασε διαμπερές ἵνδῃ καὶ ἵνδῃ,
Πυκνὸς καὶ θαλάσσιος, τὸ μέλας ὄρνυς ἀμφικαύσας. And Ἰλ. ω.
Ἀμφὶ δ' οἱ μαχάλλω αὐτῷ ποίνων ἀνακτὴν
Σταυροῖσιν πυκνοῖσι.

These are the same which Homer elsewhere calls *σκόλοπις* * and the ancient Grammarians render each by other. As Eustathius; Σταυροῖ, ὅρα καὶ ἡ ποικυμυρία ἔχου. οἱ δ' αὖτις καὶ σκόλοπις λέγον, ἀπ' οὗ τὸ ἀνασκολοπιζέσθαι, καὶ ἀνασταυρῆσαι. so he expounding *σταυρός*. And in the same manner expounding *σκόλοπις* λέγον, τῶ οἱ τοῦτοι σκόλοπις καὶ σταυροῖ ἐκ τῶ τῶτων τὸ ἀνασκολοπιζέσθαι, καὶ ἀνασταυρῆσαι. As when Homer describes the Phæacian walls, τείχεα μακρὰ, τ' ἱλὰ, σκόλοπιον ἀνεστήτα, he gives this exposition: Σκόλοπις τὸ καὶ ὄν ἐξ ἑνὸς ὅρα, οἱ καὶ σταυροῖ. In the same manner Hesychius; Σταυροῖ, οἱ καταπικρυγῶσι σκόλοπις, χόρσας. and, Σκόλοπις, ὅρα (l. ὅρα) καὶ ὅρα ἔχου, σταυροῖ, χόρσας. and again, Χόρσας, φεγγαῖς, ὅρα ἔχου. οἱ καὶ, καὶ αὐτοῖς, οἱ καὶ, σταυροῖς. Besides they all agree in the same Etymology, καὶ τὸ ἵσασι. and therefore always take it for a straight standing stake, pale, or palisade. Thus *κεκρίσθαι* in Antiphon are briefly rendered ὅρα ἔχου. but more expressly thus by Etymologus, Κεκρίσθαι, κρείσας οἱ ἰσθμοῖς, καταχρηστικῶς τὸ καὶ καταπικρυγῶσι ἔχου, καὶ καὶ σταυροῖς καὶ ἵσθαι. This is the undoubted signification of *σταυρός*, in vain denied by Salmasius, who will have it first to signify the same with *furca*, and then with *crux*; first the figure of T, and then of T. Whereas all antiquity renders it no other then as a straight and sharp stake. In which signification it came at first to denote this punishment, the most simple and prime *σταυρῶσις* or *ἀνασκολοπις* being upon a single piece of wood, a defixus & erectus stipes. And the Greeks which wrote the Roman history used the word *σταυρός* as well for their palus, as their *crux*. As when Antony beheaded Antiochus the King of the Jews, Dion thus begins to describe his execution: Ἀντιόχον ἐμαστῶσι σταυροῖς φεσθῆναι. not that he crucified him, as Baronius mistakes; but that he put him to another death after the Roman custom, as those died in Livy, l. 28. Deligati ad palum, virgisque caesi, & securi percussu. so that *σταυρῶσις* is, ad palum deligare. Thus were the heads of men said *ἀνταυρῶμεν*, as of Niger and Albinus in Dio and Herodian; which cannot be meant but of a single palus: and we read in Ctesias how Amytis put Inarus to death, ἀνταυρῶσι τὸ ἐπὶ τριῶν σταυροῖς. not that he crucified him upon three crosses, but pierced his body with three stakes fastened in the ground, and sharped at the upper end. As appears by the like Persian punishment inflicted by Pansatis on *Δεσάβας*, delivered by Platarch in *Artaxerxes*: στρογγυλῶν ὀκτὶ καὶ ἑνὸς, καὶ τὸ ἐπὶ σῶμα παχέον διὰ τριῶν σταυρῶν ἀνταυρῶσαι, τὸ δὲ σῶμα χαλεπὸν διαπικρυγῶσι. which the Latine Translator renders, in tres sustolli cruces, (a thing impossible;) whereas it was to be transversely fastened to three stakes piercing the body lying, and thrust down upon them; which in the *Excerpta* of Ctesias is delivered only in the word *ἀνταυρῶσις*. *σταυρός* therefore is no more originally then *σκόλοπος*, a single stake, or an erect piece of wood, upon which many suffered who were said *ἀνταυρῶμεν* and *ἀνασκολοπιζέσθαι*. And when other transverse or prominent parts were added in a perfect cross, it retained still the original name, not only of *σταυρός*, but also of *χρόλος*. as, ἀνταυρῶσις ἐπὶ τριῶν καὶ ἑνὸς καὶ χόλου. καὶ τὸ χόλος τὸ γυνεὺς ἀφ' ὧν ἔχουσιν, &c. πῶς ἐπὶ τῷ χόλῳ τὸ αὐτὸ φανῶν ἐπ' ἀπέναντι. Celsus apud Orig. l. 2. Thus in that long, or rather too long, verse written by *Andax* to S. Augustine, *Epist.* 139. Explicat quos plena fides Christi de stipe pendens

The form then of the Cross on which our Saviour suffered was not a simple, but a compounded, Figure, according to the custom of the Romans, by whose Procurator he was condemned to die. In which there was not only a straight and erected piece of wood fixed in the earth, but also a . transverse Beam fastned unto that towards the top thereof: and beside these two

. That the Figure and parts of a Roman Cross,

such as that was on which our Saviour suffered, may be known, we must begin with the first composition is the frame or structure of it. And that is the conjunction of the two beams, the one erect, the other transverse; the first to which the body was applied, the second to which the hands were fastened. These two, as the chief parts of the Cross, are several ways expressed. First, by the Jews, who had no one word in their language particularly to express that punishment, (as being not mentioned in the Law, or at all in use among them,) and therefore call it by a double name, expressing the conjunction of these beams, צלב וקנה, flamen & subtegmen, the warp and the woof. The Greeks express the same by the letter Τ, as, partly appears by what is already spoken of the number 300, and is yet more evident by the testimony of Lucian, who makes mankind complain of the letter Τ, because Tyrants in imitation of that first made the Cross. Τὸ γὰρ τὸ τὸ σῶμα φασὶ τὰς πνεύμας ἀποκτείνεσθαι, καὶ μυσσημένους τὸ πάθος, ἵπταται ὑψηλῇ τοῦτο ἔχου κατακτανταί, ἀνθρώπων ἀνασκολοπιζέσθαι αὐτῷ. Jude Vocal. Ipsa est enim litera Græcorum Tau, nostra autem T, species crucis. Tertull. adv. Marc. l. 3.

¶ That which was written over the head of our Saviour is called simply by S. Luke *ἡ ἐπιγραφὴ*, by S. Matthew *αἰτίαι*, by S. Mark *ἡ ἐπιγραφὴ καὶ αἰτίαι*, and by S. John *πίτλα*, making use of a Latine word, as is observed by Nonnus; *Καὶ Πιλάτῳ ὁμιλῶν ἐπιγραφὰς μαρτυροῦντος Γεζύμου, τὸν καλέσεν Πιλάτῳ πίτλαν ἰσθῆ*. From all which we may collect, that there was an Inscription written over the head of our Saviour, signifying the Accusation and pretended Crime for which he was condemned to that death. *Gloss. Ver. Αἰτία, causa, materia, titulus.* As Ovid. *Trist. 3. Eleg. 1.*

*Causa superpositæ scripto testata coronæ,
Servatos cives indicat hujus ope :*

that is, *OB CIVES SERVATOS* was *ἡ ἐπιγραφὴ καὶ αἰτίαι*, *causâ scripto testata.* In the language of Suetonius, *Titulus, qui causam pœnæ indicavit.* As Ovid. *Fast. 6.*

*Vixit ut occideret damnatus crimine regni :
Hunc illi titulum longa fenestra dabat.*

This was done according to the Roman custom; as we read in Dio, l. 54. of the son of Cæpio, *ἡ δὲ τῶν αἰτίων ἀναγεγραμμένη ἐστὶν ἐπὶ τῇ σταυρῇ*. This title was written upon a Table, and that Table fastned to the upper part of the Cross. The Syriack, Arabick and Persian Translations render *πίτλα* expressly a Table. And Hesychius, *Πίτλα, ἡ ἐπὶ τῇ σταυρῇ ἐπιγεγραμμένη ἔχου*, (not *ἔχων*, as it is printed) not the Inscription itself, but that upon which the Inscription was written. Thus the Epistle of the French unto the Christians in Asia represents the Inscription of the Martyr Attalus in a Table: *ἐπὶ τῇ σταυρῇ καὶ τῇ ἀμφιδιάσει, πίτλα καὶ αὐτῶν ἐπιγραφῶν*, ἐν ᾧ ἐπιγεγραμμένον *Ρωμαῖσι, Οὗτός ἐστιν Ἀτταλὸς ὁ Χριστιανός*. Euseb. l. 5. c. 1. And Sozomen, describing the invention of the Cross by Helena, says there were three several Crosses in the same place: *καὶ ἡρώς ἄλλο ἐξ ὧν ἐν μέρει λαβόμενα ὁ ρήματι καὶ γεγραμμένην ἔβραυκας, ἑλλωκοῖς καὶ ῥωμαῖκοῖς*. This Nicephorus calls *λαβὼν παλαιοῦ*, which is the proper interpretation of *λαβόμενα*. Suidas, *Λαβόμενα, τὸ ἔχειν* (Etymol. *πίναξ*) *καὶ ἀνελκεμὲν καὶ ἐπὶ σταυρῶν πολλῶν ἀναγεγραμμένων ἐπιτίθει*. Hesych. *Σταῖς, δῦος, λαβόμενα*, (as Julius Pollux joins *σταῖς* and *λαβόμενα* together,) *ἐν ᾧ αἱ γεγραμνῆς Ἀθήνησι ἐγεγράφοντο καὶ τοῖς κατέργοντο* πῶς *καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτῃ*, leg. *σταυρῇ*. His meaning is, that such a *λαβόμενα* as contained the accusation or crime of malefactors was placed upon the Cross on which they suffered, and without question he spake this in reference to our Saviour's Cross, because he used in a manner the same words with S. John: *πίτλα ἐπὶ τῇ σταυρῇ*, says Hesych. *ἔθηκεν ἐπὶ τῇ σταυρῇ*, saith S. John. It was therefore a Table of wood whited and fastned to the top of the Cross, on which the Accusation or Crime was written, as it is expressed by Nicephorus: *σταῖς λαβὼν ἡ βασιλῆα ὅτι Ἰουδαίων γεγράφον ὁ Πιλάτῳ ὡς κατέργησεν ἐπὶ ταύτῃ, ἐν εἰδει σέλης βασιλῆα ὅτι Ἰουδαίων καὶ σταυρωθῆναι κηρύττων*. Hist. Eccl. l. 8. c. 29. And thus there were, as Xanthopulus observes, *Ὁ σταυρὸς, ἡ λαὶ, καὶ γεγραμνῆς πίτλα ἀνω*.

Thus by the propriety of the Punishment, and the titular Inscription, we know what Crime was then objected to the immaculate Lamb, and upon what Accusation Pilate did at last proceed to pass the Sentence of death upon him. It was not any opposition to the Law of Moses, not any danger threatened to the Temple, but pretended Sedition and affectation of the Crown objected, which moved Pilate to condemn him. The Jews did thus accuse him; *We found this fellow perverting the Nation, and forbidding to give tribute to Cæsar, saying that he himself is Christ a King.* And when Pilate sought to release him, they cried out, saying, *If thou let this man go, thou art not Cæsar's friend: whosoever maketh himself a King speaketh against Cæsar.* This moved Pilate to pass sentence upon him, and, because that punishment of the Cross was by the *Roman* custom used for that crime, to crucifie him.

Luke 23.2.

John 19.12.

† *Auctores seditionis aut tumultus, pro qualitate dignitate, aut in crucem tolluntur, aut bestiis obijciuntur.* Paulus l. 5. tit. 22.

¶ *Illa morte pejus nihil fuit inter omnia genera mortium.* S. Aug. in Joan. Tract. 36. Tully calls it *crudelissimam*

Two things are most observable in this Cross; the Acerbity, and the Ignominy of the punishment: for of all the *Roman* ways of Execution it was most painfull, and most shameful. First, the exquisite Pains and Torments in that death are manifest, in that the Hands and Feet, which of all the parts of the body are most nervous, and consequently most sensible, were pierced through with Nails; which caused, not a sudden dispatch, but a lingering and tormenting death. Inasmuch that the *Romans*, who most used this punishment, did in their language deduce their expressions of pains and *cruciation* from the Cross. And the Acerbity of this punishment appears, in that those who were of any mercifull disposition would . . first cause such as were adjudged to the Cross to be slain, and then to be crucified.

multum terribilissimumque supplicium; and Aufonius, pœnæ extremum.

* *Ubi dolores acerrimi exagitant, cruciatus vocatur, à cruce nominatus: pendentes enim in ligno crucifixi, clavis ad lignum pedibus masibusque confixi, producta morte necabantur.* Non enim crucifigi hoc erat occidi, sed diu vivebatur in Cruce: non quia longior vita eligebatur, sed quia mors ipsa protendebatur, ne dolor citius finiretur. S. Aug. Tract. in Joan. 36. To this Etymologie diu Terence allude in those words, & illis crucibus, quæ nos nostramque adolescentiam habent despiciunt, & quæ nos semper omnibus cruciant modis. As it was observed of Julius Cæsar: *Piratas à quibus captus est, cum in ditionem redegerisset, quoniam suffixurum se cruci ante juraverat, jugulari prius iussit, deinde suffigi.* Suet. l. 1.

Asthis Death was most dolorous and full of acerbity, so was it also most infamous and full of Ignominy. The *Romans* themselves accounted it a

† *Vulcatius
Gallicanus*
relaterh of *A-
vidius Cassi-
us*, in the case
of *(some Centu-
rions which*
*had been pros-
perous, that in*
*fighting with-
out Orders giv-
en, Rapi cos*
juſſit, & in
crucem tolli,
ſervilique
*ſupplicio affi-
ci: quod exem-
plum non exu-
labat. And Juvenal*
ſpeaks with
relation to
this cuſtom,
Pone crucem
ſervo. So Pa-

† servile punishment; and inflicted it upon their Slaves and Fugitives. It was a high crime to put that dishonour upon any Free-man; and the greatest indignity which the most undeserving * *Roman* could possibly suffer in himself, or could be contrived to shew their detestation to such creatures as were below ∴ humane nature. And because when a man is beyond possibility of suffering pain, he may still be subject to ignominy in his fame; when by other exquisite torments some men have tasted the bitterness of death, after that, they have in their † breathless corps by virtue of this punishment suffered a kind of surviving shame. And the exposing the bodies of the dead to the view of the people on the Cross hath been thought a † sufficient ignominy to those which died, and terrour to those which lived to see it. Yea, where the bodies of the dead have been out of the reach of their surviving enemies, they have thought it highly opprobrious to their ghosts, to take their representations preserved in their * Pictures, and affix them to the Cross. Thus may we be made sensible of the two grand aggravations of our Saviour's Sufferings, the bitterness of Pain in the torments of his body, and the indignity of Shame in the interpretation of his enemies.

Leſtario in Plautus; Nifi quidem illa nos vult, qui ſervi ſumus, Propter ſuum amorem omnes crucibus contubernales dari. *And again*; Noli mimitari; ſcio crucem futuram mihi ſepulchrum. Ibi majores mei ſiti ſunt, pater, avus, proavus, abavus. *So in Terence, Pam.* Quid meritus es? *Da. Crucem*; and *Horace*, Si quis cum ſervum patinam qui tollere juſtus, Semefos piſces tepidumque liquoris juſ, In cruce ſuffigat. *So Capitolinus of Pertinax*, in crucem ſublatis talibus ſervis; and *Herodian of Maximianus*, οἱ δὲ οὗτοι δακτύλους καὶ γὰρ ἔχοντες ἀντιποδοποιεῖσθαι. *This Punishment of the Croſs did ſo properly belong to the Slaves, that when Servants and Free-men were involved alike in the ſame crime, they were very careful to make a diſtinction in their death, according to their condition*: Ut quique liber aut ſervus, ſux fortunæ at quoque ſumpſum ſupplicium eſt. *Liv. l. 3. And then the Servants were always crucified. As Servius obſerves among the Lacedæmonians*: Servos patibulis ſuffixerunt, filios ſtrangulavere, nepotes fagaverunt. *Antid. 3.* Novære quidem perpetuum indicium exilium, ſervus vero patibulo ſuffigitur. *Apul. Metam. l. 10.* *Tous in the combustion at Rome, upon the death of Julius Cæſar*; Ἀμυνόμενοι ἀντιπρόσθοντες, καὶ Συμπαρόντες ἐπὶ τοῖς καπνισμοῖς οὗτοι δρεγέποντες ἦσαν, οἱ δὲ ἐλεύθεροι καὶ οἱ δὲ ἀρχὸντες καὶ πρὸς τὸν καπνὸν. *Appian. de Bell. civil. l. 2.* Ea nocte ſpectatores prehens ſervi tres, & unus ex legione vernacula: ſervi ſunt in crucem ſublatis, militi cervices abſciſſæ. *Hirtius l. de Bell. Hiſpan. 30.* *So Africans*: Gravius in Romanos quam in Latinos tranſlugas animadvertit: illos enim, tanquam patriæ fugitivos, crucibus affixit; hos, tanquam perfidos focios, ſeuri percuffit. *Valer. Max. l. 2.* *This puniſhment of the Croſs was ſo proper unto Servants, that ſervile ſupplicium in the language of the Romans ſignifies the ſame*: and though in the words of *Valerian* before cited they go both together, as alſo in *Capitolinus*, Nam & in crucem milites tulit, & ſervilibus ſupplicis ſemper affecit; yet either is ſufficient to expreſs Crucifixion: as in *Tacitus*, malam potentiam ſervili ſupplicio expiavit, *Hiſt. 4.* and again, Sumpſum de eo ſupplicium in ſervilem modum, *Hiſt. 2.* And therefore when any ſervants were made free, they were put out of fear of ever ſuffering this puniſhment. An vero ſervos noſtros horum ſuppliciorum omnium metu dominorum benignitas una vindicta liberavit; vos à verberibus, ab unco, crucis denique terrore, neque res geſtæ, neque acta ætas, neque noſtri honores vindicabant? *Cic. Orat. pro Rabir.*

* Carnifex, & obductio capitis, & nomen ipsum *Crucis* absit, non modo à corpore civium Romanorum, sed etiam à cogitatione, oculis, auribus. Harum enim omnium rerum non solum eventus atque perperissio, sed etiam conditio, expectatio, mentio denique, indigna cive Romano atque homine libero est. *Cic. Orat. pro Rabir.* Facinus est vincire civem Romanum, scelus verberare, parricidium necare: quid dicam in crucem tollere, crudelissimum retrerrimumque supplicium? verbo satis digno tam nefaria res appellari nullo modo potest. *Idem q. in Verrem.* ∴ *As when the Capitol was betrayed by*

satis digno tam nefaria res appellari nullo modo potest. *Idem* *g.* in *Verrem*. As when the Capitol was betrayed by
 the silence of Dogs, but preserved by the noise of Geese, they preserved the memory by a solemn honouring of the one yearly, and dishonouring
 the other. Eadem de causa supplicia annua canes pendunt, inter ædem Junonis & Summani vivi in furca sambucca arbore
 fixi. *Plin. l. 9. c. 4.* Πικρατέδης μάχαι νῦν ἐπὶ μήνην καὶ πέτα Συμπλαμάτων ἡ πόλις, κύνων καὶ ἀνιστανομένων, χελῶν δὲ μάλα ἐπὶ
 σιωπῆς πεπλητῆς καὶ φοβῆς καὶ δόμοι. *Plutarch, de Fort. Rom.* As Ozymes the Persian, when he had treasur-

roastly and cruelly murdered Polykrates the Tyrant of Samos, ἀνελθὼν δὲ μὴ ἐκ ἀδείας ἀπαρῆναι ἀνταρπύσας. Herod. l. 3. So Antiochus first cut off the head of Acheus, and then fastened his body to a Crofs. "Εὐδοξὸς ἀνελθὼν μὲν ἀνταρπύσας αὐτὸν ἑτάπηται, καὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν ἐκταρπύσας αὐτοῦ, ἐν σταφύλειαις ἐς ὄρθον ἀνέσθρι, ἀνταρπύσας αὐτὸν ἐβύμα. † This was

* Thus they used Celsus, one of the 30 Tyrants of Rome, as Trebellius Pollio testified: Novo injuriae genere imago in crucem sublatâ, persultante vulgo, quasi patibulo ipse Celsus videretur affixus.

go in crucem sublata, persultante vulgo, quasi patibulo ipse Celsus videretur affixus.

It is necessary we should thus profess Faith in *Christ crucified*, as that punishment which he chose to undergo, as that way which he was pleased to die. First, because by this kind of death we may be assured that he hath taken upon himself, and consequently from us, the malediction of the Law. For we were all under the Curse, because it is expressly written, *Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the Law*

Law to doe them: and it is certain none of us hath so continued; for the *Scripture hath concluded all under sin*, which is nothing else but a breach of Gal. 3.22. the Law: therefore the Curse must be acknowledged to remain upon all. But now *Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the Law, being made a curse* Gal. 3.13. for us; that is, he hath redeemed us from that general curse, which lay upon all men for the breach of any part of the Law, by taking upon him that particular curse, laid onely upon them which underwent a certain punishment of the Law; for it was written, *Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree.* Dent. 21.23. Not that Suspension was any of the capital punishments prescribed by the Law of Moses; not that by any tradition or custom of the Jews they were wont to punish malefactors with that death: but such as were punished with death according to the Law or custom of the Jews, were for the enormity of their fact oft-times after death exposed to the ignominy of a Gibbet; and those who † being dead were so hanged on a tree, were accursed by the Law. †Dent. 21.22. If a man have committed a sin worthy of death, and he be put to death, and thou hang him on a tree. In which words, being put to death precedeth being hanged. But, I confess, in our English translation it

Now though *Christ* was not to die by the sentence of the Jews, who had lost the supreme power in causes capital, and so not to be condemned to any death according to the Law of Moses; yet the providence of God did so dispose it, that he might suffer that death which did contain in it that ignominious particularity to which the Legal curse belonged, which is, *the hanging on a tree.* For he which is crucified, as he is affixed to, so he hangeth on, the Cross. And therefore true and formal Crucifixion is often named by the general word ∴ Suspension; and the Jews themselves do commonly call our blessed Saviour by that very † name to which the Curse is affixed by Moses; and generally have objected that he died a * cursed death.

hath another sense, [and he be to be put to death,] as if he were to die by hanging. And so the Vulgar Latine, Et ad judicatus morti appensus fuerit patibulo; as if he were adjudged to be hanged, and so his sentence were Suspension. And the Syriack yet more expressly, & appendatur ligno argue interficiatur. But there is no such sentence contained in the Original as the Vulgar, nor futuration of death as our English Translation mentioneth. The Hebrew is מותו in Hophal, that is, interfectus, occisus, mori factus fuerit; or, as the LXX clearly translate it, ἐκτελέσθη, and the Chaldeæ, מותו & occisus fuerit. ∴ As we before noted on the words of Seneca. Thus the Greeks do often use κρεμάω for crucifigere. For Curtius, speaking of the taking of Tyre by Alexander, says, Duo millia crucibus affixa per ingens litroris spatium pependunt. And Diodorus Siculus relating the same, Τὸς ὅς τις πάλαι ὄντας ἐκτελέσθησαν ὅς διὰ τὸν χρόνον ἐκτελέσθησαν. So the same Curtius testifies that Muscanus was in crudem sublatu: of whom Arrianus speaks thus; οὗτον κρεμάσαντες Ἀλέξανδρος κατέβη ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ὄντος. Thus is the language of the Scriptures, ὅς τις πάλαι ὄντας ἐκτελέσθησαν, Luke 23. 39. and the Jews are said to have slain our Saviour κρεμάσαντες ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ὄντος, Acts 5. 30. & 10. 39. The Latines likewise often use the word suspendere for crucifigere. As Ausonius, in the Idyllium whose title is Cupido cruci affixus, describes him thus, Hujus in excello suspensum stipite Amorem. And when we read in Polybius, that they did ἀνασταυρώσαντες τὸν Κομμα of Athens; Ovid describes his punishment thus,

More vel intereas capti suspensus Achæi,
Qui miser aurifera recte pependit aqua.

† The words of Moses are Dent. 21. 23. קללתו אלהים תלהו, maledictio Dei suspensus: and this word תלהו, which is of itself simply suspensus, as 2 Sam. 18. 10. I saw Absalom תלהו באלה hanging on an oak, is ordinarily attributed by the Jews to our Saviour, to signify that he was crucified. Hence they term Christians עובדי תלהו cultores suspensi; and they call the Crucifix תורה תלהו figuram suspensi. ∴ So Trypho the Jew objected to Justin Martyr: ὅς τις ὁ δὲ μὲν τὸ κρεμάσθαι καὶ τὸ ἀνασταυρῶσαι ὡς ἀδελφὸν ἡγορεῖται, ὡς καὶ τὴν ἐξ ἀρχῆς καταρτά τὴν ἐκ τοῦ νόμου τὴν ἐκ τοῦ φημιστοῦ ἀνασταυρῶσαι λέγει. Dial. cum Tryph.

Secondly, it was necessary to express our Faith in *Christ crucified*, that we might be assured that he hath *abolished in his flesh the enmity*, even the Law of Eph. 2. 15. *commandments*; which if he had not done, the strength and power of the whole Law had still remained. For all the people had said *Amen* to the Curse Dent. 27. 26. upon every one that kept not the whole Law; and *entred into a curse and into an oath, to walk in God's law, which was given by Moses the servant of God, and to observe and doe all the commandments of the Lord their God, and his judgements and his statutes.* Which was in the nature of a Bill, Bond or Obligation, perpetually standing in force against them, ready to bring a forfeiture or penalty upon them, in case of non-performance of the condition. But the strongest Obligations may be cancelled; and one ancient custom of cancelling Bonds was, by striking a nail through the writing: and thus God, by our

of all, and what also he received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures; that the Messiah was the Lamb slain before the foundations of the world, and that his death was severally represented and foretold. For though the sacrificing Isaac hath been acknowledged an expresse and lively Type of the promised Messiah; though, after he was bound and laid upon the wood, he was preserved from the fire, and rescued from the religious cruelty of his father's knife; though Abraham be said to have offered up his onely-begotten Son, when Isaac died not; though by all this it might seem foretold that the true and great promised seed, the Christ, should be made a sacrifice for sin, should be fastned to the Cross, and offered up to the Father, but not suffer death: yet being without effusion of blood there is no remission, without death no sacrifice for sin; being the saving of Isaac alive doth not deny the death of the Antitype, but rather suppose and assert it, as prefiguring his Resurrection from the dead, from whence Abraham received him in a figure; we may safely affirm the ancient and legal Types did represent a Christ which was to die. It was an essential part of the Paschal Law, that the Lamb should be slain: and in the Sacrifices for sin, which prefignified a Saviour to sanctifie the people with his own blood, the bodies of the beasts were burnt without the camp, and their blood brought into the sanctuary.

Nor did the Types onely require, but the Prophecies also foretell, his Death. For he was brought, saith Isaiah, as a Lamb to the slaughter: he was cut off out of the land of the living, saith the same Prophet; and made his soul an offering for sin. Which are so plain and evident predictions, that the Jews shew not the least appearance of probability in their evasions.

† That this place of Isaiah must be understood of the Messiah, I have already proved against the Jews out of the Text, and their own Traditions. Their objection particularly to these words is, that the land of the living is the land of Canaan. So Solomon Jarchi, מִמֶּלֶךְ חַיִּים הוּא אֶרֶץ יִשְׂרָאֵל, *as if the land of the living must be the land of Canaan, because David professeth he will walk before the Lord in the land of the living; whereas there is no more in that phrase, then that he will serve God while he liveth. As Psal. 27. 13. I had fainted, unless I had believed to see the goodness of the Lord in the land of the living; and Isa. 38. 11. I said, I shall not see the Lord, even the Lord in the land of the living; which is sufficiently interpreted by the words which follow, I shall behold man no more with the inhabitants of the world. The land of the living then was not particularly the land of Canaan: nor can they persuade us that it could not refer to Christ, because he was never removed out of that land: but to be cut off out of the land of the living is, certainly, to be taken away from them which live upon the earth, that is, to die.*

† That this place of Isaiah must be understood of the Messiah, I have already proved against the Jews out of the Text, and their own Traditions. Their objection particularly to these words is, that the land of the living is the land of Canaan. So Solomon Jarchi, מִמֶּלֶךְ חַיִּים הוּא אֶרֶץ יִשְׂרָאֵל, *as if the land of the living must be the land of Canaan, because David professeth he will walk before the Lord in the land of the living; whereas there is no more in that phrase, then that he will serve God while he liveth. As Psal. 27. 13. I had fainted, unless I had believed to see the goodness of the Lord in the land of the living; and Isa. 38. 11. I said, I shall not see the Lord, even the Lord in the land of the living; which is sufficiently interpreted by the words which follow, I shall behold man no more with the inhabitants of the world. The land of the living then was not particularly the land of Canaan: nor can they persuade us that it could not refer to Christ, because he was never removed out of that land: but to be cut off out of the land of the living is, certainly, to be taken away from them which live upon the earth, that is, to die.*

Being then the obstinate Jews themselves acknowledge one Messiah was to die, and that a violent death; being we have already proved there is but one Messiah foretold by the Prophets, and shewed by those places which they will not acknowledge that he was to be slain: it followeth by their unwilling confessions and our plain probations, that the promised Messiah was ordained to die: which is our first Assertion.

Secondly, we affirm, correspondently to these Types and Prophecies, that Christ our Passover is slain, that he whom we believe to be the true and onely Messiah did really and truly die. Which affirmation we may with confidence maintain, as being secure of any even the least deniall. Jesus of Nazareth upon his Crucifixion was so surely, so certainly dead, that they which wished, they which thirsted for his blood, they which obtained, which effected, which extorted his death, even they believed it, even they were satisfied with it: the chief Priests, the Scribes and the Pharisees, the Publicans and sinners, all were satisfied; the Sadduces most of all, who hugged their old opinion, and loved their errour the better, because they thought him sure for ever rising up. But if they had denied or doubted of it, the very stones would cry out and confirm it. Why did the Sun put on mourning? why were the graves opened, but for a Funerall? Why did the earth quake? why were the rocks rent? why did the frame of Nature shake, but because the

1 Cor. 5. 7.

the God of nature died? Why did all the people who came to see him crucified, and love to feed their eyes with such Tragick spectacles, why did they beat upon their breasts and return, but that they were assured *it was finished*, there was no more to be seen, all was done? It was not out of compassion that the merciless Souldiers brake not his legs, but because they found him dead whom they came to dispatch; and being enraged that their cruelty should be thus prevented, with an impertinent villany they pierce his side, and with a foolish revenge endeavour to kill a dead man; thereby becoming stronger witnesses then they would, by being less the authours then they desired, of his death. For out of his sacred, but wounded, side came blood and water, both as evident signs of his present death, as certain seals of our future and eternall life. These are the two blessed Sacraments of the Spouse of *Christ*, each assuring her of the death of her beloved. The Sacrament of Baptism, the water through which we pass into the Church of *Christ*, teacheth us that he died to whom we come. *For know you not, saith S. Paul, that so many of us as are baptized into Jesus Christ, are baptized into his death?* The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, the Bread broken, and the Wine poured forth, signifie that he died which instituted it; and *as often as we eat this bread and drink this cup, we shew forth the Lord's death till he come.*

Dead then our blessed Saviour was upon the Cross ; and that not by a feigned or metaphoricall, but by a true and proper, death. As he was truly and properly man, in the same mortal nature which the sons of *Adam* have ; so did he undergoe a true and proper death, in the same manner as we die. † Our life appeareth principally in two particulars, Motion and Sensation ; and while both or either of these are perceived in a body, we pronounce it lives. Not that the Life it self consisteth in either or both of these, but in that which is the original principle of them both, which we call the Soul ; and the intimate presence or union of that Soul unto the body is the life thereof. The real distinction of which Soul from the body in man our blessed Saviour taught most clearly in that admonition, *a Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul ; but rather fear him which is able to destroy both body and soul in hell.* Now being Death is nothing else but the privation or * reversion of Life, and we are then properly said to die when we cease to live ; being Life consisteth in the Union of the Soul unto the Body, from whence, as from the fountain, flow Motion, Sensation, and whatsoever vital perfection ; Death can be nothing else but the solution of that vital union, or the actual † separation of the Soul, before united to the Body. As therefore when the Soul of man doth leave the habitation of its body, and being the sole fountain of vitality bereaves it of all vital activity, we say that body or that man is dead : so when we read that *Christ* our Saviour died, we must conceive that was a true and proper death, and consequently that his body was bereft of his Soul, and of all vital influence from the same.

† Τὸ ἐμψυ-
χον τὸ ἀψυχον
λοιοῖν μάλισται
διὰ τρεῖς ὁ-
κται, καὶ πάλιν τὸ
ἐκ τῆς αἰσθη-
τικῆς. παρὰ
ἀποσώμην τὸ καὶ
ἐκ τῆς ὁμο-
γενεῖας
ἡμετέρας
ἔχουσιν δύο
ταῦτα ὅτι
ψυχον. Arist.
de anima, l. I.
c. 2. "Ὁ ἀψυ-
χὸς τὸ ἀψυ-
χον (leg. ἐμ-
ψυχον) τὸ ἀ-
ψυχον, ὅτι
ἐστὶ ψυχὸν δι-
αφέρει τὸ κα-
τανοῦν, αἰσθη-
τικόν, καρδιαστόν,
ποικίλον, Salust.
de Diis et
Mundo, c. 8.
Mall. 10.

■ *As Secundus, ευχή καὶ ἀποκρίσεις εἶναι.*

[illegible]

Οὐ καὶ ἐν ἀρμονίᾳ ἀναγγέλλω ἀνθρώποις.
Ψυχὰς γὰρ μέμνηται ἀλλοιοὶ ἐν ᾧ ἔμμελλουσιν.
Πνεῦμα γὰρ ἐστὶ θεῶν ῥητῆς ἐν τοῖς καὶ ἐκείνων.
Σῶμα γὰρ ἐκ γυναικὸς ἔχουσιν, καὶ πάντες ἐς αὐτὴν
ἀνθρώποις καὶ ἐσθλῶν· ἀλλ' ὅτι ἀνὰ πνεῦμα δίδωκε.

So Tertullian: Opus autem mortis in medio est, discretio corporis animæque. *De Anima* cap. 51. Si mors non aliud determinatur quam disjunctio corporis animæque, contrarium morti vita non aliud definitur quam conjunctio corporis animæque, *ibid.* c. 27. This description of Death is far more philosophical than the notion of Aristotle, who makes it to consist in the corruption of natural heat; (*Ἀνάγκη τοίνυν αὐτὰ τὸ πῦρ ἀποδεῖν καὶ τὸ πῦρ δεῖν φασὶν ὅτι τὸ πῦρ ἐστὶν ἀκαίματος, καὶ τὸ ἀκαίματος σώματος τὸ πῦρ τὸ ἐξ ὧν ἐστὶν ἡ ζωὴ.* *Parv. Natural.*) inasmuch as the Soul is not that natural heat, and the corruption of that heat followeth upon the separation of the Soul.

Luke 23. 46.

† This is expressed three ways, all signifying the separation of his Soul from

his body. S. Mark and S. Luke ἐξέπνευσεν, which is of the same force with ἐξέλυσε. But because ἐκλύειν doth not always signify an absolute expiration, but sometimes a disparting only: as Hesychius, ἐκλύουσι, ἀπεδιδυμένοι; so Hippocrates useth it, Εἰς τὴν δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ (καρδίας) ὅπου ἐστὶν ἐκλύουσι δὲ τὴν ἀρετήν, i. e. de Morbis; and again, ἐκλύουσι τὴν διὰ τὸ αἷμα καὶ τὸ μετασπῆν ἐξ αἵματος συνδεδεμένον. I therefore we should take ἐξέπνευσεν in such an imperfect sense, S. Matthew hath it ἀφῆκε τὸ πνεῦμα, and S. John, παρέδωκε τὸ πνεῦμα. which is a full expression of the secession of the Soul from the body, and consequently of death, which is, in the language of Secundus, πῦρ καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς αἵματος.

These three points or distinctions of time I have therefore noted, that I might occur to any objection which possibly might arise out of the ancient Philosophical subtilty, which Aulus Gellius reports to be agitated at the table of Taurus. The Question was propounded thus, Quæritur: est, quando moriens moreretur, cum jam in morte esset, an tum etiam cum in vita foret. Where Taurus admonisheth the rest, that this was no light question; for, says he, gravissimi Philosopho um super hac re serio quæsierunt; & alii moriendi verbum atque momentum manente adhuc vita dici atque fieri putaverunt; alii nihil in illo tempore vitæ reliquerunt, totumque illud quod mori dicitur morti vendicant. The ancient Philosophers were divided; some saying a man died in the time of his life, others in the time of his death. But Plato observed a contradiction in both; for a man can neither be said to die while he is alive, nor when he is dead: & idcirco peperit ipse aliud quoddam novum in confinio tempus, quod verbis propriis atque integris τὸ ἐκείνου χρόνον appellavit: which he thus describes in his Parmenides; Τὸ δὲ ἐκείνου χρόνου τὸ πῶτα (ὑμῶν) αἶμα, ὡς ἐκ ἐκείνου μεταλλάσσοντος ἐκείνου. So A. Gellius l. 6. c. 13. Thus when our Saviour commended his Soul into the hands of the Father, he was yet alive; when the soldier pierced his side, he was already dead; and the instant in which he gave up the ghost was the τὸ ἐκείνου χρόνον when he died.

This reality and propriety of the Death of *Christ* is yet farther illustrated from the cause immediately producing it, which was an externall violence and cruciation, sufficient to dissolve that natural disposition of the body which is absolutely necessary to continue the vital union of the Soul: the torments which he endured on the Cross did bring to that state in which life could not longer be naturally conserved, and death, without intervention of supernatural power, must necessarily follow.

For *Christ*, who took upon him all our infirmities, Sin onely excepted, had in his nature not onely a possibility and aptitude, but also a necessity of dying; and as to any extrinsecall violence, able according to the common course of nature to destroy and extinguish in the body such an aptitude as is indispensably required to continue in union with the Soul, he had no natural preservative; nor was it in the power of his Soul to continue its vital conjunction unto his body bereft of a vital disposition.

John 10. 18.

It is true that *Christ* did voluntarily die, as he said of himself, *No man taketh away my life from me, but I lay it down of my self: I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again.* For it was in his power whither he would come into the power of his enemies; it was in his power to suffer or not to suffer the sentence of *Pilate*, and the nailing to the Cross; it was in his power to have come down from the Cross, when he was nailed to it: but when by an act of his will he had submitted to that Death, when he had accepted and embraced those Torments to the last, it was not in the power of his Soul to continue any longer Vitality to the body, whose Vigour was totally exhausted. So not by a necessary compulsion, but voluntary election, he took upon him a necessity of dying.

Mark 15. 44.

It is true that *Pilate* marvelled he was dead so soon, and the two thieves lived

ved longer to have their legs broken, and to die by the accession of another pain: but we reade not of such long furrows on their backs as were made on his, nor had they such kind of Agony as he was in the night before. What though *he cried with a loud voice, and gave up the ghost?* what though *the Centurion, when he saw it, said, Truly this man was the Son of God?* The miracle was not in the death, but in the voice: the strangeness was not that he should die, but that at the point of death he should cry out so loud: he died not by, but with, a miracle.

Mark 15:37, 39.

Should we imagine *Christ* to anticipate the time of death, and to substract his Soul from future torments necessary to cause an expiration; we might rationally say the *Jews* and *Gentiles* were guilty of his death, but we could not properly say they slew him: guilty they must be, because they inflicted those torments on which in time death must necessarily follow; but slay him actually they did not, if his death proceeded from any other cause, and not from the wounds which they inflicted: whereas *S. Peter* expressly chargeth his enemies, *“ Him ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain; and again, “ The God of our fathers raised up Jesus, whom ye slew, and hanged on a tree.* Thus was the Lamb properly slain, and the *Jews* authours of his Death, as well as of his Crucifixion.

Acts 2:23; Acts 4:30
In both which places the Original sheweth more expressly that by their Crucifixion they slew him: in the former thus, *ἡμεῖς αὐτὸν σταυρώσαντες ἀπέκταντες* in the latter thus, *ὅτι ὑμεῖς σταυρώσαντες ἀπέκταντες*

Wherefore being *Christ* took upon himself our mortality in the highest sense, as it includeth a necessity of dying; being he voluntarily submitted himself to that bloody Agony in the garden, to the hands of the Plowers who made long their furrows, and to the nails which fastned him to the Cross; being these Torments thus inflicted and continued did cause his death, and in this condition *he gave up the ghost*: it followeth, that the onely-begotten Son of God, the true *Messias* promised of old, did die a true and proper death. Which is the second Conclusion in this Explication,

But thirdly, because *Christ* was not onely Man, but also God, and there was not onely an union between his Soul and Body while he lived, but also a conjunction of both Natures, and an union in his Person: it will be farther necessary, for the understanding of his Death, to shew what Union was dissolved, what continued; that we may not make that Separation either less or greater than it was.

Whereas then there were two different substantial Unions in *Christ*, one of the parts of his humane nature each to other, in which his Humanity did consist, and by which he was truly Man; the other of his Natures Humane and Divine, by which it came to pass that God was Man, and that man God: first, it is certain, as we have already shewed, that the union of the parts of his humane nature was dissolved on the Cross, and a real separation made between his Soul and body. As far then as Humanity consists in the essential union of the parts of humane nature, so far the Humanity of *Christ* upon his death did cease to be, and consequently he ceased to be Man. But secondly, the union of the natures remained still as to the parts, nor was the Soul or body separated from the Divinity, but still subsisted as they did before, by the subsistence of the second person of the Trinity.

The truth of this Assertion appeareth, first from the language of this very *† Creed*. For as we proved before, that the onely-begotten and eternall Son of God, God of God, very God of very God, was *conceived, and born, and suffered*, and that the truth of these Propositions relied upon the communion

† Credimus certe non in solum Deum Patrem, sed & in Jesum Christum filium ejus unicum, Dominum nostrum; totum ibi intellige, & verbum, & animam, & carnem. Sed utique confiteris etiam illud quod habet eadem Fides, in eum Christum te credere qui crucifixus est & sepultus. Ergo etiam sepultum Christum esse non negas, & tamen sola caro sepulta est. Si enim erat ibi anima, non erat mortuus; si autem vera mors erat, & ejus vera sit resurrectio, sine anima fuerat in sepulchro, & tamen sepultus est Christus. Ergo Christus erat etiam sine anima caro, quia non est sepulta nisi caro. *S. August. in Job. Tract. 48.*

of Properties, grounded upon the hypostatical union: so while the Creed in the same manner proceedeth speaking of the same person, that he *was buried and descended into hell*, it sheweth that neither his body, in respect of which he was buried, nor his Soul, in respect of which he was generally conceived to descend into hell, had lost that union.

Again, as we believe that God redeemed us by his own blood, so also it hath been the constant language of the Church, that God died for us; which cannot be true, except the Soul and body in the instant of separation were united to the Deity.

Indeed, being all the gifts of God are without repentance, nor doth he ever substract his grace from any without their abuse of it, and a sinfull demerit in themselves; we cannot imagine the grace of union should be taken from *Christ*, who never offended, and that in the highest act of obedience, and the greatest satisfaction to the will of God.

This true, *Christ* cried upon the Cross with a loud voice, saying, *My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?* * But if that dereliction should signifie a solution of the former union of his Natures, the separation had been made not at his death, but in his life. Whereas indeed those words infer no more, then that he was bereft of such joys and comforts from the Deity, as should assuage and mitigate the acerbity of his present torments.

* Greg. Nyss.
Orat. 1. de
Resurr. "Ολον
τὸ ἀνθρώπου
τὸ θεῖον διὰ τὸ
πρὸς ἑαυτὸν
ἀνακράσας
εἰς τὴν θεῖαν

φύσιν μετακτάσας, ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τῷ καὶ τὸ πάθος οἰκονομίας ἡ διατρεχέμενος τὸ ἀπ᾽ ἐν γὰρ ἀνεχώρησεν ἀμεταμέλητα
τὸ θεῖον τὸ καὶ τὸ ἀνθρώπου τὸ καὶ τὸ πάθος οἰκονομίας ἡ διατρεχέμενος τὸ ἀπ᾽ ἐν γὰρ ἀνεχώρησεν ἀμεταμέλητα

It remaineth therefore, that when our Saviour yielded up the ghost, he suffered onely an external violence; and what was subject to such corporal force did yield unto those dolorous impressions. Being then such is the imbecility and frailty of our nature, that life cannot long subsist in exquisite torments; the disposition of his body failed the Soul, and the Soul deserted his body. But being no power hath any force against Omnipotencie, nor could any corporal or finite agent work upon the union made with the Word; therefore that did still remain entire both to the Soul and to the body. The Word was once indeed without either Soul or body; but † after it was made flesh, it was never parted either from the one or from the other.

† This is the
conclusion of
S. August. Ex

quo Verbum caro factum est, ut habitaret in nobis, & susceptus est à Verbo homo, id est totus homo, anima & caro, quid fecit passio, quid fecit mors, nisi corpus ab anima separavit? animam vero à Verbo non separavit. Si enim mortuus est Dominus.... sine dubio caro ipsius expiravit animam, (ad tempus enim exiguum anima deferuit carnem, sed redeunte anima resurrecturam) à Verbo autem animam separatam esse non dico. Latronis animæ dixit, *Hodie mecum eris in Paradiso*. Fidelem latronis animam non deserebat, & deserebat suam? Absit: sed illius ut Dominus custodivit, suam vero inseparabiliter habuit. Si autem dixerimus, quia ipsa se anima posuit, & iterum ipsa se sumpsit, absurdissimus sensus est: non enim quæ à Verbo non erat separata à seipsa potuit separari. Tract. in Joh. 47.

Thus *Christ* did really and truly die, according to the condition of death, to which the nature of man is subject: but although he was more then man, yet he died no more then man can die: a separation was made between his Soul and body, but no disunion of them and his Deity. They were disjoyned one from another, but not from him that took them both together; * rather by virtue of that remaining conjunction they were again united after their separation. And this I conceive sufficient for the third and last part of our explication.

* Ἐπειδὴ
πάντε τὸ
ἀνθρώπου
σώμαμα,
ἀπὸ τοῦ καὶ
μετακτάσας
ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τῷ καὶ τὸ πάθος οἰκονομίας ἡ διατρεχέμενος τὸ ἀπ᾽ ἐν γὰρ ἀνεχώρησεν ἀμεταμέλητα

θεοτότης, ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τῷ καὶ τὸ πάθος οἰκονομίας ἡ διατρεχέμενος τὸ ἀπ᾽ ἐν γὰρ ἀνεχώρησεν ἀμεταμέλητα
τὸ θεῖον τὸ καὶ τὸ ἀνθρώπου τὸ καὶ τὸ πάθος οἰκονομίας ἡ διατρεχέμενος τὸ ἀπ᾽ ἐν γὰρ ἀνεχώρησεν ἀμεταμέλητα
Orat. 1. de Resurr. Tam velox incorruptæ carnis vivificatio fuit, ut major ibi esset soporis similitudo quam mortis; quoniam Deitas, quæ ab utraque suscepti hominis substantia non recessit, quod potestate divisit, potestate conjunxit. Leo Serm. 1. de Resurr.

The

The necessity of this part of the Article is evident, in that the Death of *Christ* is the most intimate and essential part of the Mediatourship, and that which most intrinsically concerns every Office and function of the Mediator, as he was Prophet, Priest, and King.

First, it was necessary, as to the Prophetical Office, that *Christ* should die, to the end that the truth of all the Doctrine which he delivered might be confirmed by his Death. He was ^a *the true and faithfull witness*, ^b *who before Pontius Pilate witnessed a good confession*. ^c *This is he that came by water and blood: and there are three that bare witness in earth, the spirit, the water, and the blood*. He preached unto us a new ^d *and better covenant, which was established upon better promises*, and that was to be ratified with his blood; which is therefore called by *Christ* himself the ^e *blood of the new Testament*, or ^f *everlasting Covenant*: for that Covenant was also a testament; and ^g *where a testament is, there must also of necessity be the death of the testator*. Beside, *Christ*, as a Prophet, taught us not onely by word, but by example; and though every action of his life, who came to fulfill the Law, be most worthy of our imitation; yet the most eminent example was in his death, in which he taught us much variety of Christian Vertues. What example was that of Faith in God, ^h *to lay down his life, that he might take it again*; in the bitterness of his torments to ⁱ *commend his spirit into the hands of his Father*; and ^k *for the joy that was set before him, to endure the cross, and despise the shame*? What a pattern of Meekness, Patience, and Humility, for ^l *the Son of man to come not to be ministred unto, but to minister, and give his life a ransom for many*; ^m *to be led like a sheep to the slaughter, and like a lamb dumb before the shearer, not to open his mouth*; to ⁿ *endure the contradictions of sinners against himself*, and to ^o *humble himself unto death, even the death of the cross*? What a precedent of Obedience, for the Son of God to learn obedience by the things that he suffered; to be made under the Law, and, though he never broke the Law, to become obedient unto death; to go with cheerfulness to the Cross upon this resolution, *as my Father gave me commandment, even so I doe*? What exemplar of Charity, to die for us while we were yet sinners and enemies, when greater love hath no man then this, to lay down his life for his friends; to pray upon the Cross for them that crucified him, and to apologize for such as barbarously slew him, *Father, forgive them, for they know not what they doe*? Thus *Christ* did suffer for us, leaving us an example that we should follow his steps; that as he suffered for us in the flesh, we should arm our selves likewise with the same mind. For he that hath suffered in the flesh hath ceased from sin: That he no longer should live the rest of his time in the flesh, to the lusts of men, but to the will of God. And so his Death was necessary for the confirmation and completion of his Prophetical Office.

Secondly, it was necessary that *Christ* should die, and by his death perform the Sacerdotal Office. For every High-priest taken from among men, is ordained for men in things pertaining to God, that he may offer both gifts and sacrifices for sins. But *Christ* had no other sacrifice to offer for our sins then himself. For it was not possible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sins: and therefore when sacrifice and offering God would not, then said he, *Loe, I come to doe thy will, O God*; then did *Christ* determine to offer up himself for us. And because the Sacrifices of old were to be slain, and generally without shedding of blood there is no remission; therefore if he will offer sacrifice for sin, he must of necessity die, and so make his Soul an offering for sin. If *Christ* be our Pascheover, he must be sacrificed for us. We were sold under sin, and he which will redeem us must give his life for our redemption: for we could not be redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, but onely with

^a Rev. 3. 14.

^b 1 Tim. 6. 13.

^c 1 Joh. 5. 6, 8.

^d Heb. 8. 6.

^e Matt. 26. 28.

^f Luke 22. 20.

^g Heb. 10. 29.

^h Heb. 13. 20.

ⁱ Heb. 9. 16.

^j Job. 10. 17.

^k Luke 23. 46.

^l Heb. 12. 2.

^m Matt. 20. 28.

ⁿ Acts 8. 31.

^o Heb. 12. 3.

^p Phil. 2. 8.

^q Heb. 5. 8.

^r Gal. 4. 4.

^s Phil. 2. 8.

^t Job. 14. 31.

^u Rom. 5. 8.

^v John 15. 13.

^w Luke 23. 34.

^x 1 Pet. 2. 21.

^y 4. 1, 2.

^z Heb. 5. 7.

^{aa} Heb. 10. 4.

^{ab} V. 8, 9.

^{ac} Heb. 9. 22.

^{ad} Isa. 53. 10.

^{ae} 1 Pet. 1. 18, 19.

with the precious blood of Christ, as of a Lamb without blemish and without spot. We all had sinned, and so offended the Justice of God, and by an act of that Justice the sentence of death passed upon us: it was necessary therefore that Christ our surety should die, to satisfy the justice of God, both for that iniquity, as the propitiation for our sins, and for that penalty, as he which was to bear our griefs. God was offended with us, and he must die who was to reconcile him to us. For when we were enemies, saith S. Paul, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son. We were sometimes alienated, and enemies in our mind by our wicked works; yet now hath he reconciled us in the body of his flesh through death. Thus the death of Christ was necessary toward the great act of his Priesthood, as the oblation, propitiation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world: and not onely for the act it self, but also for our assurance of the power and efficacy of it, (For if the blood of bulls and goats sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh; How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternall Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge our consciences from dead works?) and of the happiness flowing from it, (for he that spared not his own son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things?) Upon this assurance founded on his Death, we have the freedome and boldness to enter into the Holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way which he hath consecrated for us, through the veil, that is to say, his flesh. Neither was the Death of Christ necessary onely in respect of us immediately for whom he died, but in reference to the Priest himself who died, both in regard of the qualification of himself, and consummation of his Office. For in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren; that he might be a mercifull and faithfull High-priest, and having suffered, being tempted, might be able to succour them that are tempted: so that passing through all the previous torments, and at last through the pains of Death, having suffered all which man can suffer, and much more, he became, as an experimentall Priest, most sensible of our infirmities, most compassionate of our miseries, most willing and ready to support us under, and to deliver us out of, our temptations. Thus being qualified by his utmost suffering, he was also fitted to perfect his Offering. For as the High-priest once every year for the atonement of the sins of the people entered into the Holy of Holies not without blood; so Christ being come an High-priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect Tabernacle, not made with hands, by his own blood entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternall redemption for us. And this is the grand necessity of the Death of Christ in respect of his Sacerdotal Office.

Thirdly, there was a necessity that Christ should die in reference to his Regal Office. O King, live for ever, is either the loyal or the flattering vote for temporal Princes; either the expression of our desires, or the suggestion of their own: whereas our Christ never shewed more sovereign power then in his death, never obtained more then by his death. It was not for nothing that Pilate suddenly wrote, and resolutely maintained what he had written, *This is the King of the Jews*. That title on the Cross did signifie no less then that his Regal power was active even there: for having spoiled principalities and powers, he made a shew of them openly, triumphing over them in it; and through his death destroyed him that had the power of death, that is, the Devil. Nor was his death onely necessary for the present execution, but also for the affecution of farther power and dominion, as the means and way to obtain it. The Spirit of Christ in the Prophets of old testified before-hand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow. He shall drink of the brook in the way, saith the Prophet David; therefore shall he lift up his head. He humbled him-

Rom. 5. 10.

Col. 1. 21.

Heb. 9. 13, 14.

Rom. 8. 32.

Heb. 10. 19, 20.

Heb. 2. 7, 18.

Heb. 9. 7, 11, 12.

Col. 2. 4.
Heb. 2. 14.

1 Pet. 1. 11.

Psalm. 110. 7.
Phil. 2. 8, 9.

himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name. For to this end Christ both died, and rose, and revived, that he might be Lord of the dead and living. ROM. 14. 9.

Thus it is necessary to believe and profess our Faith in *Christ* who died: for by his blood and the virtue of his Death was our Redemption wrought, as the price which was paid, as by the atonement which was made, as by the full satisfaction which was given, that God might be reconciled to us, who before was offended with us, as by the ratification of the Covenant made between us, and the acquisition of full power to make it good unto us.

After which exposition thus premised, every Christian is conceived to express thus much when he makes profession of Faith in *Christ Jesus* which was dead: I do really and truly assent unto this, as a most infallible and fundamental Truth, that the onely-begotten and eternal Son of God, for the working out of our Redemption, did in our nature, which he took upon him, really and truly die, so as by the force and violence of those torments which he felt, his Soul was actually separated from his body; and although neither his Soul nor body was separated from his Divinity, yet the body bereft of his Soul was left without the least vitality. And thus I believe in *Jesus Christ* which was crucified and dead.

AND BURIED.

When the most precious and immaculate Soul of *Christ* was really separated from his flesh, and that union in which his natural life consisted was dissolved, his sacred Body, as being truly dead, was laid up in the chambers of the Grave: so that as we believe him *dead*, by the Separation of his Soul, we also believe him *buried*, by the Sepulture of his Body.

And because there is nothing mysterious or difficult in this part of the Article, it will be sufficiently explicated when we have shewn, first, that the promised *Messias* was to be buried; and, secondly, that our *Jesus* was so buried as the *Messias* was to be.

That the *Messias* was to be buried, could not possibly be denied by those who believed he was to die among the *Jews*; because it was the universal custom of that Nation to † bury their dead. We read most frequently of the sepulchres of their fathers: and though those that were condemned by their supreme power were not buried in their Fathers graves, yet publick sepulchres there were appointed even for them to lie in: and not onely they, but all the Instruments which were used in the punishment were buried with them. And yet beside the general consequence of death among the *Jews*, there was a perfect type in the person of *Jonas*: for as that Prophet *was three days and three nights in the whale's belly*; so was the *Messias*, or the Son of man, to be *three days and three nights in the heart of the earth*.

† It is observed by Tacitus of the *Jews*, in opposition to the Roman custom, Corpora condere, quam cremare, è more Egyptio: Hist. l. 5. As of the Egyptians by o-

thers, *Θάψουσιν ὁ Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ ταρχύουσιν, Ῥωμαῖοι δὲ καίοντες, Παῖοντες δὲ εἰς τὰς λίμνας βυθίζοντες*. Lact. Pyrrh. But the *Jews* received this custom no more from the Egyptians than from the Persians, whom they may be rather said to follow, because they used not the Egyptian *ταρχύουσιν*: neither were they more distinguished from the Romans than from the Grecians, who also burned the bodies of the dead. *Διαδόμωσι καὶ τὰ ἔθνη τὰς ταφάς, ὁ μὲν Ἑλλήνων ἔθαλον· ὁ δὲ Πέρσης ἔδαλον· ὁ δὲ Ἰνδοὶ ὕδαλον ἀφίγγουσι· ὁ δὲ Σινδῶν κατὰ διην· ταρχύουσι δὲ ὁ Αἰγύπτῳ*. Lucian. *ἀπὸ πάντων*. Although therefore it be not true, that the *Jews* received their custom of burying their dead from the Egyptians, because Abraham at the first purchased a burying-place; yet it hath been observed, and is certainly true, that their general custom was to inter. Philo, one of their own writers, *Ἀνθρώπων δὲ πάντων χρησταίους οἰκιστὴν ἐν ἡρώεσι χωρίων ἀπὸ νεκρῶν γλῶσσαι, ὁ μόνον ζῶντων, ἀλλὰ καὶ νεκρῶν, ἵν' ἡ αὐτὴ καὶ τῶν νεκρῶν ἡμετέων καὶ τῶν ἐν τῷ βίῳ παλαιοῦ ἀνάλυσιν*. l. 1. in Flaccum. * Matt. 12. 40.

Nor was his Burial onely represented Typically, but foretold Prophetically, both by a suppositive Intimation, and by an expresse Prediction. The Psalmist intimated and supposed no less, when, speaking in the person of the *Christ*, he said, *My flesh shall rest in hope: for thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy one to see corruption.* That flesh is there supposed onely such, that is, a body * dead, and that body resting in the grave, the common habitation of the dead; yet resting there in hope that it should never see corruption, but rise from thence before that time in which bodies in their graves are wont to putrefie. Beside this Intimation there is yet a clear expression of the grave of the *Messias* in that eminent Prediction of *Isaiah*; *He was cut off out of the land of the living, and he made his grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death.* For whatsoever the true interpretation of the Prophecie be, (of which we shall speak hereafter) it is certain that he which was to be cut off was to have a grave: and being we have already shewn that he which was to be cut off was the *Messias*; it followeth, that by virtue of this prediction the promised *Messias* was to be buried.

Psal. 16. 9, 10.

* So the Midrash Tillim anciently expounded it, My flesh shall rest in hope,

לאחר מותי

after death;

adding, אר

יחנק

מלמד שלא שלט בו רמיה ותולעת.

that Rabbi Isaac said, he taught by these words, that the moth and worm should have no power over him. Whence, by the Argument of S. Peter, it must be understood not of David, for his flesh saw corruption, nor of any other but the *Messias*. And although the Rabbins are wont to say that the worm shall never eat the just, in opposition to the last words of *Ezay*; yet they must confess there is no difference in the grave: and therefore that worm must signifie something else then the corruption of the body. Well therefore are those words paraphrased by Didymus, ἐν ἑλπίδι καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἡ Γῆς, διὰ τὴν ἐλπίδα ἐσκήνωσεν ἀνθρώπων. * Isa. 53. 8, 9.

Secondly, that our *Jesus*, whom we believe to be the true *Messias*, was thus buried, we shall also prove, although it seem repugnant to the manner of his death. For those which were sentenced by the *Romans* to die upon the Cross had not the favour of a sepulchre, but their bodies were † exposed to the fowls of the air and the beasts of the field, or if they escaped their voracity, to the longer injury of the * air and weather. A guard was also usually † set about them, lest any pitying hand should take the body from the cursed tree, and cover it with earth.

† To this custom Horace alludes, Epist. 1. 6. l. 1.

Non hominem occidi: non pascies in cruce corvos.

and Juvenal, Vultur, jumento & canibus crucibusque relictis, Ad fœtus properat, partemque cadaveris affert. So Prudentius, Crux illum tollat in auras, Videntesque oculos offerat alitibus, &c. Hymn. 4. This punishment did appear in the Mythologie of Prometheus; who though he were by some represented simply as διαμάρτης, by others particularly he is described as ἀνασταυρωμένος, especially by Lucian, who delivers him σεσπληνέμενον, κρεμυδόμενον, σεσπαρτηδεδωδόμενον, ἀνασταυρωμένον, ἀνασκορομένημενον. And Tertullian speaking of Pontus, from whence Marcion came; Omnia torpent, omnia rigent: nihil illic nisi feritas calet, quæ fabulas scenis dedit, de sacrificiis Taurorum, & amoribus Colchorum, & crucibus Caucaforum. Adv. Marcion. l. 1. c. 1. He touches the subject of three Tragedies, Medea, Iphigenia in Tauris, and Prometheus Vincetus, or rather Crucifixus. As therefore the Eagle there did feed upon his liver, so were the bodies of crucified persons left to the promiscuous voracity of carnivorous fowls. So true it was of them what Augustus once said, Cuidam sepulturam petenti respondit, jam illam in volucrum esse potestate. Suet. c. 13. Nor were they onely in the power of the fowls of the air, as Prometheus was, whom they durst not hang too low, lest men should succour him, ἐπιπυτταμένον, & σεσπληνέον ἐσταυρωμένον, says Vulcan in Lucian for that reason; but ordinarily they hung so low upon the Cross, that the voracious beasts might reach them, as Apuleius describes Patibuli cruciatum, cum canes & vultures intima protrahunt viscera.

* So the bodies were often left upon the Cross till the Sun and rain had putrefied and consumed them. As when the daughter of Polycrates did see her father's fate in a dream, to be washed by Jupiter, and to be anointed by the Sun, when he hung upon the Cross, it was performed. Πολυκράτης ὁ ἀνακρεμνόμενος ἐπιπλάσσει πάσαν τὴν ὀψιν ἡ δύστητος, ἔλπει μὲν δὲ καὶ τὸ διδοῖς εὖος σοι, ἡγήσῃ δὲ καὶ τὴν ἡλίου ἀντίς αὐτὸς ἐν τῇ Κύματι ὁ ἱκετάς. Herod. Tabl. 1. Of which Tertull. de anima, c. 46. Ut cum Polycrati Samio filia crucem prospicit de Solis unguine & lavacro Jovis. And which is farther thus expressed by Valerius Maximus: Putres ejus artus, & rabido cruore manantia membra, atque illam lævam cui Neptunus annulum manu piscatoris restituerat, situ marcidam, Samos lætis oculis aspexit. l. 6. c. 9. Thus were the bodies of the crucified left: ut in sublimi putrescerent. Quid? Cyrenæum Theodorum Philosophum non ignobilem nonne miramur? cui cum Lyfimachus Rex crucem minaretur, istis, quæso, inquit, ista horribilia minitare purpuratis tuis? Theodori quidem nihil interest humine an sublime putrescat. Cicero l. 1. Tusc. Quæst. And so they perished, as the Scythians generally did, according to the description of Silius Italicus, l. 13.

At gente in Scythica suffixa cadavera truncis
Lenta dies sepelit, putri liquentia tabo.

Thus, whether by the fowls or beasts, or by the injury of time and weather, the flesh of those which were crucified was consumed; as Arctemidorus observed, who concluded from thence, that it was bad for the rich to dream of being crucified: Τὸς ὁ πλούσιος ἐκείνου γυμνοῖ δὲ σταυρῶν. & τὰς Κάκους ἐκκελεύουσιν οἱ σταυρωθέντες. Onirocr. l. 2. c. 58.

¶ As appeareth by that Relation in Petronius Arbitr: Imperator Provincie latrones iussit crucibus affigi. Proxima autem nocte, cum miles qui cruce afferebat, ne quis ad sepulturam corpora detraheret, &c. And when that souldier was absent, itaque cruciarii unus parentes, ut viderunt laxatam custodiam, detraxere nocte pendentem, supremoque mandaverunt officio. Where we see the souldier set for a guard, and the end of that custodia, (which the Greek Lexicographers do not will consent to the σταδία πρὸς Ἀρκατωμένη ὁμιλῶν) is kept

keep the body of him which was crucified from being buried by his friends. Thus when Cleomenes was dead, his body was fastened to a Cross (another example of the ignominy of his punishment) by the command of Ptolemy: *Ὁ δὲ Πτολεμαῖος, ὡς ἔγραψεν ταῦτα, προσέταξε τῷ δὲ Σώματι τοῦ Κλεομένηος χρημασθαι κατεστυπώσασθαι.* where *χρημασθαι* is again to be observed as taken for *ἀναστυπώσασθαι* for not long after in the same Author it follows, *Ὁλίγους δὲ ὕστερον ἡμέρας, οἱ τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Κλεομένηος ἀναστυπώσαντες ἀναστυπώσαντες ἐξέδωκεν εὐμεγέθην δέσπονα τῇ παραλῇ ἀντιπαρῶντων, καὶ ἀποκρύπτοντα τὸ σῶμα, ὡς μὴ δὲν ὄρεον ἐφίπτετο σαρκοφάγον.* where we see a guard set to keep him from burial, and the voracious fowls ready to seize on him, had they not been kept off by a serpent involving his head. Thus were there soldiers upon the crucifixion of any person set as a guard, & *ἀναστυπώσαντες ἀναστυπώσαντες, or μέγιστες, & crucem asservantes, viz. ne quis ad sepulcrum corpus detraheret.*

Under that custom of the *Roman Law* was now the body of our Saviour on the Cross, and the guard was set; there was *the Centurion and they that were with him, watching Jesus.* The Centurion returned as soon as *Christ* was dead, and gave testimony unto *Pilate* of his death: but the watch continueth still. How then can the ancient Predictions be fulfilled? how can this *Jonas* be conveyed into the belly of the whale? where shall *he make his grave with the wicked, or with the rich, in his death of crucifixion?* By the providence of him who did foretell it it shall be fulfilled. They which petitioned that he might be crucified shall intercede that he may be interred. For the *custom* of the *Jews* required, that whosoever suffered by the sentence of their Law should be buried, and that the same day he suffered. Particularly they could not but remember the express words of *Moses*, *“If a man have committed a sin worthy of death, and he be put to death, and thou hang him on a tree; His body shall not remain all night upon the tree, but thou shalt in any wise bury him that day. Upon this general custom and particular Law, especially considering the sanctity of the day approaching, the Jews, that the bodies should not remain upon the Cross on the Sabbath-day, besought Pilate that their legs might be broken, and that they might be taken away. And this is the first step to the Buriall of our Saviour.”*

† מצות
עשה
לקבור
את כל
הרוג
ביום
ההוא

Maimon.
Tract. Sanh.
cap. 15. So Jo-
sephus. To-
σῶμα τῷ Ιου-
δαίου ἀπὸ
τῆς τιμῆς
σῶνται
ποιμῶν,

ὡς καὶ τὸν ἐν κατεστυπώσαντες ἀναστυπώσαντες ὡς δὴ τὸ ἡλὸς ἀνελθὼν καὶ δὴ τὸ πῦρ. De Bell. Jud. l. 14. c. 18.

† Dent. 21.

For though by the common rule of the *Roman Law*, those which were condemned to the Cross were to lose both Soul and body on the tree, as not being permitted either sepulture or *mourning*; yet it was in the power of the Magistrate to *indulge* the leave of burial: and therefore *Pilate*, who crucified *Christ* because the *Jews* desired it, could not possibly deny him burial when they requested it; he which professed to find no fault in him while he lived, could make no pretence for an accession of cruelty after his death.

† Non solent autemlageri (ut Neratius ait) hostes, vel perduellionis damnati, nec suspensiofi, nec qui ma-

nus sibi intulerunt, non radio vitæ, sed mala conscientia. Digest. l. 3. tit. 2. l. Liberorum.

* So Ulpianus, l. 9. de

Officio Proconsulis: Corpora eorum qui capite damnantur cognatis ipsorum neganda non sunt; & id se observasse etiam Divus Augustus libro decimo de vita sua scribit. Hodie autem eorum in quos animadvertitur corpora non aliter sepeliuntur quam si fuerit petisum & permittum: & nonnunquam non permittitur, maxime majestatis causa damnatorum. So Paulus l. 1. Sententiarum: Corpora animadversorum quibuslibet petentibus ad sepulturam danda sunt. Obnoxios criminum digno supplicio subiectos sepulturæ tradi non veramus, Cod. l. 3. tit. 43. l. 11.

Now though the *Jews* had obtained their request of *Pilate*, though *Christ* had been thereby certainly buried; yet had not the prediction been fulfilled, which expressly mentioned the *rich in his death.* For as he was crucified between two thieves, so had he been buried with them, because by the *Jews* there was appointed a publick place of burial for all such as suffered as Malefactors.

Wherefore to rescue the body of our blessed Saviour from the malicious hands of those that caused his Crucifixion, *there came a rich man of Arimathea, named Joseph, an honourable counsellor, a good man and a just, who also himself waited for the kingdom of God, being a disciple of Jesus, but secretly for*

Matt. 27.
Mark 15.
Luke 23.
John 19.

F f 2

fear

fear of the Jews : this Joseph came and went in boldly unto Pilate, and besought him that he might take away the body of Jesus. And Pilate gave him leave, and commanded the body to be delivered : he came therefore and took the body of Jesus.

John 3.1, 10.
19.39.40.

Beside, there came also Nicodemus, which at the first came to Jesus by night, a man of the Pharisees, a ruler of the Jews, a Master of Israel; this Nicodemus came and brought a mixture of myrrhe and aloes, about an hundred pound weight. Then took they the body of Jesus, and wound it in linen clothes, with the spices, as the manner of the Jews is to bury.

And thus was the Burial of the Son of God performed according to the custom of the people of God. For the understanding of which there are three things considerable : first, what was done to the body, to prepare it for the Grave ; secondly, how the Sepulchre was prepared to receive the body ; thirdly, how the persons were fitted by the interring of our Saviour to fulfill the Prophecie.

Mark 14.3.8.

As for fulfilling the custom of the Jews as to the preparation in respect of his body, we find the spices and the linen clothes. When there came a woman having an alabaster box of ointment of spikenard, very precious, and she brake the box and poured it on his head ; Christ made this interpretation of that action, she is come before-hand to anoint my body to the burying. When Christ was risen,

Mark 16.1.
Luke 24.1.

Mary Magdalen and the other Mary brought the spices which they had prepared, that they may come and anoint him. Thus was there an interpreted and an intended unction of our Saviour, but really and actually he was interred with the spices which Nicodemus brought. The custom of wrapping in the clothes

John 11.44.

we see in Lazarus rising from the grave ; for he came forth bound hand and foot with grave-clothes, and his face was bound about with a napkin. In the

John 20.6,7.

same manner when our Saviour was risen, Simon Peter went into the sepulchre and saw the linen clothes lie, and the napkin that was about his head, not lying with the linen clothes, but wrapped together in a place by it self. Thus according to the custom of the Jews was the body of Christ bound in several linen clothes with an aromatical composition, and so prepared for the sepulchre.

† There are four words in the Gospel expressing the linen clothes in which the dead were buried, Σινδών, ὀδόνια, κειρία, & Κασιέριον. The Σινδών is used by three Evangelists, as what was brought by Joseph. Καὶ ἀροσάσαι σινδῶνα, καὶ καθίλων αὐτὸν ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ σινδῶνι, Mark 15.46. and S. Matthew and S. Luke, ἐπεπλήξεν αὐτὸ σινδῶνι. Ὀδόνια is used by S. Luke and S. John, Ἐλάθον ἐν τῷ σώματι Ἰησοῦ, καὶ ἔδυσαν αὐτὸ ὀδόνιοις. Now both these words shew that the clothes were linen. Σινδών, tunica lineæ, Gloss. Φασσώνιον, λιγὺν πη, ἢ τὸ σινδῶνιον, Etym. So Ὀδόνια, λιγὰ ἱμάτια, Hesych. This was according to the custom of the Jews, amongst whom there was a kind of law that they should use no other grave-clothes. As therefore the Egyptians in Herodotus, λίσσιντες ἢ νεκρὸν κατελίσσαντο τὸν αὐτοῦ τὸ σῶμα σινδῶνι βυσσίνι, so the Jews. But it is farther to be observed, that S. John saith ἔδυσαν αὐτὸ ὀδόνιοις, they bound up his body with several clothes, which signifies it was done fasciatim. As Herodotus in another case, σμικρῶσι ἢ ἰσχυροῖσι τὰ ἔλκεια, καὶ σινδῶνι βυσσίνι τελαμῶσι κασιέριοις. Whereas then Julius Pollux observes, ἄρα δὲ πῶς καὶ τελαμῶν σινδῶνις. I conceive these ὀδόνια in S. John were such τελαμῶνες σινδῶνι, lineæ fasciæ, or institæ, called in the case of Lazarus κειρία : for as he is described δεδεμένος κειρία, so it is said of the body of Christ, ἔδυσαν αὐτὸ ὀδόνιοις, they bound him with linen bandages or swathes. These are the ἐντάφια δεσμά, as the Grammarians interpret κειρία tanquam κειρία. So the ancient MS. in the Library at St. James's read it, δεδεμένος τὰς χεῖρας καὶ τοὺς πόδας κειρία. And so Hesychius read it, when he made that interpretation, Κειρία (leg. Kneia) ἐντάφια ἐντεταλινγμόδια. What anciently κειρία was, will appear by the words of Julius Pollux : Καὶ μὴν τόξα τῇ κλίνῃ ἢ τοῖς σάμπεδι ἐντεταμῶν, οἳ φέρον τὰ πέλαια, σαρπίνα, αὐρίλα, τόνον, κειρία, the banas or cords by which the beds or couches are fastened, and upon which the bedding lies. In this sense it is to be taken in that known place of Aristophanes, in Avibus,

Σάρπιν γὰρ ἂν δεῖμιλ ἐγὼ τῇ μὴ πέλει,
Οὐδ' ἂν χαμῶνιν πάντα κειρία ἔχον.

Of which Eustathius libad. β'. gives us this account : Φησὶ μὴ ἂν δεῖμιλ αὐρῆς, κειρία ἔχον ἢ πῶς μὴ δεῖμιλ αὐρῆς πέλματι, ἂν ἂν ἔχει κειρία, ἢ τὸ δεσμὸν κλίνης. Hence the Grammarians gave that interpretation of κειρία : as Etymologus, Κειρία (σημαίνει τὸ χοῖνον τὸ δεσμῶν τῷ κλίνῃ, viz. in reference to that place of Aristophanes : otherwise it hath no relation to a bed, but indifferently significeth any fascia or band. So the Scholiast of Aristophanes ; Ἡ δὲ κειρία ἢ δὲ ζώνη ἐκ χοῖνιαν περιεὶκάς ἢ δὲ δέσμη τὰς κλίνας, not the cord of a bed, but a fascia or girdle like unto it. With such linen fasciæ, swathes, or bandages, was the body of Lazarus involved. Ἐκ πῶς ἀρχὴ καλῶς Σφρηγῶντος κατέστη ἐλὼν θάλας ἔχον κειρία, says Nonnus And Juvenius,

Nec mora, connexis manibus pedibusque repente
Procedit tumulo, vultum cui linea texit,
Et totum gracilis connectit fascia corpus,

Hence Basil Bishop of Seleucia makes Lazarus come out of the grave to life like an infant in swaddling-clothes. *Ἐκείθεν ἀνέστη νεκρὸς περὶ αἰῶνα τὸ πρῶτον περιεβύθη* (ὡς μωλὸν· καὶ τὸ δάκρυον ἀποσταύωσθαι, πλὴν τῶν πολλῶν ἐκ ἡλιαζαλο, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ σάλῳ καὶ κλεισὺν ὡς ἐν τῷ πρῶτῳ, καὶ τὸν φέρον τὸ ἀναργαῖον. *Orat. in Publican. & Phariseis.* The κλεισὺν then were infants, as the Vulgar Latin; fasciæ, as Juvenius and the Syriack Translation, *אסר בפסקית*, *vinculus fasciis.* Of the same nature I conceive were the ὀδόνια mentioned in our Saviour's burial; and so S. Augustine does express them in reconciling the rest of the Evangelists, who mentioned only Joseph and the sindon, with S. John, who addeth Nicodemus and the ὀδόνια. Neque hic aliquid repugnet recte intelligentibus. Neque enim illi qui de Nicodemo tacuerunt, affirmaverunt à solo Joseph Dominum sepultum, quamvis solius commemorationem fecerint; aut quia illi una sindone à Joseph involutum dixerunt, propterea prohibuerunt intelligi & alia linthea potuisse afferri à Nicodemo & superaddi: ut verum narraret Johannes quod non uno lintheo, sed lintheis, involutus sit; quamvis & propter sudarium quod capiti adhibebatur, & insitis quibus totum corpus alligatum est, quia omnia de lino erant, etiam una sindon ibi fuit, verissime dici potuit, ligaverunt eum lintheis. *De consensu Evang. l. 3. c. 23.* These which he calls insitæ quibus totum corpus alligatum est, were the *תכריכי המות*, involucre mortui. Beside these, we read in the history of Lazarus, *ἡ ὁψις αὐτοῦ (σινδαιὼν περιεβύθη), John 11. 44.* and of our Saviour, *καὶ τὸ (σινδαιὼν) ὁ λῶν ἐπὶ τῷ κεφαλῇ αὐτοῦ.* The same is rendered by the Syriack *ܠܝܢܐ*, and Nonnus makes it a Syriack word, *καὶ αὐτὸν πεπύκαστο καὶ ἡμιμυαλὶ κακλαδα κίονον, σινδαιὼν τὸ σφῆπτρον Σῦρων σῶμα.* whereas the word is not of a Syriack, but Latine origination, and from the Latines came to the Greek and Eastern people; Sudor and Sudare, from thence Sudarium. Vatinus reus, agente in eum Calve, sudario candido frontem deterfit. *Quintil. Suetonius of Nero.* Plerumque prodiit in publicum ligato circa collum sudario. This was translated into their own language by the latter Greeks, to signify that which before was called *ἡμιτύσιον* and *κακλαδῶπον*, as is observed by Julius Pollux: *τὸ δ' ἡμιτύσιον, ἔσθ' ἢ καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ αὐτῶν, ἐν ᾧ ἂν καὶ τὸ ἐν τῇ μέσῃ Κωμῶσι κακλαδῶπον καλεῖσθαι, ὁ νῦν (σινδαιὼν) ὀνομαζέται.* *Αεσπερ δὲ γὰρ ἐν Πλάτῳ τοιαύτη τις ἡ ὁψίς, Ἐπειτα καὶ σαδὲν ἡμιτύσιον λαβὼν, τὰ βλεῖρα καὶ σφῆπτρον* where τὰ βλεῖρα καὶ σφῆπτρον is the same with that in *Quintilian*, frontem dederit; *ἡμιτύσιον* then was the same with Sudarium. So the Scholiast upon that place: *ἡμιτύσιον· βάλει ἡμιτυσίαν, αὐτὸν πρὸς ὅσον μαλαγέον.* This is the proper signification of *σινδαιὼν*, viz. a linen cloth used to wipe off sweat: but when it was translated into the Chaldaee or Syriack language, it received a more general signification, of any cloth, or veil, or covering of linen, for any other use. As *Ruth 3. 15.* Bring the veil that thou hast upon thee: the Chaldaee readeth it, *חבית ער*, *סודרה דר*, and it held for measures of barley. So, when Moses is said to put a veil on his face, *Exod. 34. 33.* the Chaldaee again readeth it *סודרה דבית אקונן דבית ער*. So the Rabbin ordinarily use *סודרה על רישיה*, the veil or covering of his head: and in that sense it is here taken, not with any relation to the Etymology, as Nonnus conceived in those words, *Θεμὸν ἔχον ἵδρωτα καὶ ἡμιμυαλὶ κακλαδα*, as if Lazarus had come sweating out of his grave; but the only use, as being bound about the head, and covering the face, which the Epistle of Anacialis calls sudarium mortuorum.

As for the preparation of the sepulchre to receive the body of our Saviour, the custom of the Jews was also punctually observed in that. Joseph of Arimathea had prepared a place of burial for himself, and the manner of it is expressed. For in the place where he was crucified, there was a garden, and in the garden a new sepulchre wherein never man was laid, which Joseph had hewen out of the rock for his own tomb: there laid they Jesus, and rolled a great stone to the dore of the sepulchre. And so Christ was buried after the manner of the Jews, in a Vault made by the excavation of the rocky firm part of the earth, and that Vault secured from external injury by a great massy stone rolled to the mouth or door thereof. After which stone was once rolled thither, the whole funeral action was performed, and the Sepulture completed: so that it was not * lawfull by the custom of the Jews any more to open the sepulchre, or disturb the interred body.

Matth. 27.
Mark 15.

† Strabo observeth of Jerusalem, that the ground about it, *ἐν τῇ ἐξήκοντα σάδιον*, was *καὶ ὀκτώσας*, for nine miles rocky

underneath. Is is therefore no wonder that in a garden so near Jerusalem there should be found ground which was petrosæ. It is said therefore of Joseph, that *μημίον ἐλατόμουν ἐν τῇ πέτρᾳ* of the sepulchre, that *ἦν λελαομυμῶν ἐν πέτρᾳ, καὶ λαξ δὲ τῷ*, which signifie no less than that it was cut out of a rock: and Nonnus makes a particular paraphrase to that purpose of *λαξ δὲ τῷ* only, *ἔκαστ' ἐν γαίῃ κήρυξ Τίμωσ' ὁ δὲ μὲν τῷ βαθυμωμῶν ἐν πέτρᾳ Τελυθὲς ὁ δὲ νεύει καὶ*. where *βαθυμωμῶν* signifies the excavation of the rock, and *γλυφῶν* the manner by which that excavation was performed by incision or excuspion. But Salmasius hath invented another way, making the earth to be digged, and a sepulchre built by art of stone within it. And this interpretation be endeavours to prove out of the text: first, alledging that *πέτρα* signifies, in the writers of that Age, a stone, not a rock; and therefore *λελαομυμῶν ἐν πέτρᾳ*, is ἐν λίμῃ, made of stone: otherwise the Articles would have been added, *ἐν τῇ πέτρᾳ*, if he meant the rock which was there. But this is soon answered; for in S. Matthew the Article is expressly added, *ἐλατόμουν ἐν τῇ πέτρᾳ*. S. Matthew therefore understood it of that rock which was in the garden: and the rest without question understood the same. Again, he objects that *λατομῶν* signifies not only lapides ex lapidicina cadere, but also polire & quadrare ad ædificandum; and *λαξ δὲ τῷ* signifies the last only. Wherefore being it is said not only *λελαομυμῶν*, which may be understood of building, but also *λαξ δὲ τῷ*, which can be understood of no other; therefore he concludes that it was a Vault built of square stone within the ground. But there is no necessity of such a precise sense of *λαξ δὲ τῷ*, which may be extended to any sense of *λατομῶν*, (as Origen indifferently *λατομῶν ἢ λαξ δὲ τῷ* *μημίον ἐν πέτρᾳ*) and that, when it speaks of a Jewish custom, must be taken in that sense which is most congruous to their custom, and as they used the word. Now they rendered the word *צבן* by *λατομῶν*, as 1 Kings 5. 15. *צבן* *λατομῶν* ἐν ὄρε. Isa. 51. 1. *אין* *צבן* *צבן*, *ἐκλεῖπτε* *ἐν τῷ σφῆπτῳ* *πέτρᾳ* *ἐν λελαομῶν*, unde excili. As therefore *Deut. 6. 11.* *ἀκούω λελαομῶν* *ἐκ ἐξελαιόμωσας*, Jo 14. 22. 16. *Ὅτι ἐλατόμωσας σκαυτὸν ὡς μνημῖον, καὶ ἐξελαιόμωσας ἐν πέτρᾳ* *Χλῶν* in both places *λατομῶν* is nothing else but *צבן*, and there *μημίον λελαομῶν* in the language of the Jews is to be taken in the same sense with *λαξ δὲ τῷ* *λελαομῶν*, that is, digged or hewn out of the ground. This is well expressed by Orig. *Ἡ παρὴν ἔχει πλὴν καὶ σαδὲν τὰ δὲ τῷ (σινδαιὼν) ἀναμῶν ἐν τῷ σφῆπτῳ αὐτοῦ τὸ σῶμα ἐν μνημῶν καὶ ὡς ὅσον* *ἐκ ἐν λελαομῶν λίθων οἰκοδομημένη, καὶ πλὴν ἔχον ἐν σφῆπτῳ, ἀλλ' ἐν μαὶ καὶ ὅσον ἡνικαὶ πέτρᾳ λατομῶν καὶ λαξ δὲ τῷ*. l. 2. adu. Celsum. And this cutting the sepulchre out of the rock, rather than building of it is the earth, is very material in the opinion of S. Jerome, who makes this observation on *Matth. 27.* In monumento novo, quod excilium fuerat à petra conditus est, ne si ex multis lapidibus ædificatum esset, suffossis tumuli fundamentis, ablatus furto diceretur; and gives this interpretation of the Prophet Isaiah, Quod autem in sepulchro ponendus.

Thirdly, it was most convenient that those pious solemnities should be performed on the body of our Saviour, that his Disciples might for ever learn what honour was fit to be received and given at their Funerals. When *Ananias* died, though for his sin, yet they *wound him up, and carried him out, and buried him*: when *Stephen* was stoned, *devout men carried him to his burial, and made great lamentation over him*: and when *Dorcas* died, they *washed her, and laid her in an upper chamber*. So carefull were the Primitive Christians of the rites of Burial. Before, and at our Saviour's time, the *Greeks* did much, the *Romans* more, use the burning of the bodies of the dead, and reserved onely their ashes in their urns: but when Christianity began to encrease, the funeral flames did cease, and after a few † Emperours had received Baptism, there was not a body burnt in all the *Roman* Empire. For the first Christians wholly abstained from consuming of the dead bodies with fire, and followed the example of our Saviour's funeral; * making use of precious ointments for the dead, which they refused while they lived, and spending the spices of *Arabia* in their graves. The description of the persons which interred *Christ*, and the enumeration of their Vertues, and the everlasting commendation of her who brake the box of precious ointment for his buriall, have been † thought sufficient grounds and encouragements for the carefull and decent sepulture of Christians. For as natural reason will teach us to give some kind of respect unto the bodies of men, though dead, in reference .∴ to the Souls which formerly inhabited them: so, and much more, the followers of our Saviour, while they looked upon our bodies as living *temples of the Holy Ghost*, and bought by *Christ*, to be made one day like unto his glorious body, they thought them no ways to be * neglected after death, but carefully to be laid up in the wardrobe of the Grave, with such due respect as might become the honour of the dead, and comfort of the living. And this decent custom of the Primitive Christians was so acceptable unto God, that by his providence it proved most † effectual in the conversion of the Heathens, and propagation of the Gospel.

† This appeareth by *Macrobius*, who lived in the time of *Theodosius junior*, and testified thus much; Licet urendi corpora defunctorum usus nostro seculo nullus sit, lectio tamen docet, eo tempore quo igni dari honor mortuis habebatur, &c. l. 7. c. 7. That this was done by the Christians is certain, because the Heathens anciently did object it to the Christians, Inde videli-

et & execrantur rogos, & damnant ignium sepulturas. And the answer given to this objection was, Nec, ut creditis, ullum damnnum sepulturæ timeamus, sed veterem & meliorem consuetudinem humandi frequentamus. *Minut. Felix in Octavio. And Tertull.* Et hoc etiam in opinione quorundam est; propterea nec ignibus funerandum aiunt, parcentes superfluo animæ. Alia est autem ratio pietatis istius, non reliquiis animæ adulatrix, sed crudelitatis etiam corporis nomine averfatrix, quod & ipsum homo non utique meretur pœnali exitu impendi. *De Anima c. 51.* At ego magis ridebo vulgus tunc quoque, cum ipsos defunctos atrocissime exurit, quos postmodum gulossissime nutrit, iisdem ignibus & promerens & offendens. O pietatem de crudelitatem ludentem! sacrificet, an insultet, cum crematis cremat? *Idem de Resurr. Carn. c. 1.* * The Heathens objected it to the Primitive Christians; Reservatis unguenta funeribus. *Minutius Felix. And Tertullian* confesseth it: Thura plane non emimus.

Si *Arabia* queruntur, sciant Sabæi pluris & cariores suas merces Christianis sepeliendis profigari, quam Diis fumigandis. *Apol. c. 42. And speaking of spices, lib. de Idololat.* Etiam hominibus pigmenta medicinalia, nobis quoque insuper ad solatia sepulturæ usui sunt. *So Clem. Alex. Μυσζον* οἱ γὰρ νεκροί. And again, Αἱ γὰρ ὑπερμαστοὶ χεῖρας τῶν μύρων κηδείας, ἢ συμπίπτουσας ὑποπύουσι. *Pædag. l. 2. c. 8.* † Ipse Dominus die tertio resurrexurus religionæ mulieris bonum opus prædicar, prædicandumque commendat, quod unguentum pretiosum super membra ejus effuderit, atque hoc ad eum sepeliendum fecerit.

Et laudabiliter commemorantur in Evangelio, qui corpus ejus de cruce acceptum diligenter atque honorifice regendum sepeliendumque curarunt. Verum istæ autoritates non hoc admonent, quod insit ullus cadaveribus sensus: sed ad Dei providentiam, cui placent etiam talia pietatis officia, corpora quoque mortuorum pertinere significant, propter fidem resurrectionis astruendam. *S. August. de Civitate Dei, l. 1. c. 13.* .∴ Οὐδὲν ἢ λυπεῖ ἡμᾶς ἐπὶ τῷ κατὰ Ἡερκλείτην λεγέμενον, ὅτι Κέλσος παρέστη, ὅτι νέκυες εἰσι κορπῶν ἐκκλητῆρες, καὶ τοιγα ὅτι οἱ περὶ αὐτῶν τῶν κατὰ Ἡερκλείτην ἐκκλητῶν ἐστιν, εἰ δ' ἐξ ἀνθρώπων νέκυες, διὰ τὴν ἐνοικήσασαν ψυχὴν, καὶ μάλιστα ἐάν ἢ ἀσποτέρως, καὶ ἐκκλητῶν. Κατὰ γὰρ τὸν ἀσποτέρως ἢ νόμον, καὶ τῆς ἐνδεχούσης ὡς περὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα πρὸς τὰς αἰετῶν. ἵνα καὶ ὑπερβῶν τῇ δωάμεν τὴν ἐνοικήσασαν ψυχὴν ἀπορίσθῃ, καὶ τὸ ἐξελθεῖν αὐτῇ τὸ σῶμα, ὡς καὶ τὰ ἄλλα σῶματα. *Orig. adv. Cels. l. 5.* Οὐδ' ἴδ'.

Νεμεσώμαί γε καὶ ἐν
Κλαίει ὅς κα δύνῃσι βροτῶν καὶ πόντων ἐπιταῖ.
Τὸτό το κα γέρας αἰὶν ἐκτελεῖται βροτῶν
Κρεῖσται καὶ κόμῳ, βροτῶν τ' ἀπὸ δόχου παρῶν.

* Nec ideo tamen contemnenda & abjicienda sunt corpora defunctorum, maximeque justorum atque fidelium, quibus tantum organis & vasid ad omnia bona opera Sanctus usus est Spiritus. Si enim paterna vestis & annulus, ac si quid hujusmodi tanto charius est posteris, quanto erga parentes major extitit affectus; nullo modo ipsa spernenda sunt corpora, quæ utique multo familiarius atque conjunctius quam quælibet indumenta gestamus. Hæc enim non ad ornamentum vel adjutorium quod

quod adhibetur extrinsecus, sed ad ipsam naturam hominis, pertinent. S. Aug. de Civit. Dei, l. 1. c. 13. Ταῦτα τελέσαι
 ὁ ἱεροφάνης, ἀποτίθοντι ἐν οἴκῳ τιμῶν τὸ σῶμα μὲν ἑτέρον ὁμοταγῶν ἱερῶν συμμάτων. Εἰ γὰρ ἐν θυγῇ καὶ σώματι πῶς θεοφιλή
 ζῶντι ὁ κακομημῶς ἔσθῃ, τιμὴν ἔσται μὲν τῆς οὐσίας ψυχῆς καὶ τὴν συναιδέοντα αὐτῇ σῶμα καὶ τὸν ἱερὸν ἰδρωτὰ, ἔνθεν ἡ θεία
 διαμορφωὴν μὲν τῷ σφαιρῶν σώματι αὐτῇ δοῦναι τὰς ἀμοιβὰς αἰωνίους, ὡς ὁμοπορεύεται καὶ συνμιστῶν τῆς οὐσίας ἢ τῆς ἐναντίας
 ζωῆς. Dionys. Eccl. Hierarch. c. 7. Propter patrem militiam Christi deseram, cui sepulturam Christi causa non debeo, quam
 etiam omnibus ejus causa debeo? S. Hieron. Epist. ad Heliodorum. ¶ This was observed by Julian the Apostate,
 who, writing to an Idolatrous High-priest, puts him in mind of those things by which he thought the Christians gained upon the world,
 and recommends them to the practice of the Heathen Priests. Of these he reckons three; The gravity of their carriage, their kindness to
 strangers, and their care for the Burial of the dead. Τί ἐν ἡμῖς οὐκ ἔστι ταῦτα ἀρεῖν; ἢ ὁ ἀποκρίπτεται ὁ μέγιστος πῶς ἀδύνητα
 (so he calls Christianity, because they rejected all the Heathen Gods) συνμύξοντες, ἢ ὅτι τὸν ἑνὸς φιλανθρωπία, καὶ ὅτι τὰς ταράς
 τῶν νεκρῶν ἐπιμελόμεθα, καὶ ἡ πενταμερὴς λειτουργία καὶ ἡ θεία; ὅν ἔχοντες οἴομαι χεῖρα παρ' ἡμῶν ἀλλήλους ἐπιτελεῖν. Epist.
 49. ad Asiacum. And as Julian observed the care of Burial as a great encouragement to the Heathens to turn Christians, so Gregory
 Nazianzen did observe the same to the great dishonour of the Apostate, comparing his Funeral with his Predecessors. Ὁ μὲν γὰρ
 (that is Constantius) ἑταίρους ἐυφημίας καὶ τιμῆς, καὶ τέτοις δὲ τῆς ἡμετέρας σήμερον, ὅδ' αὖτε παννύχους
 καὶ ἀδελφῶν; αἱς Χριστιανοὶ τιμὰς μέγιστον εὐσεβὴν νομίζοντες καὶ γινέμενοι πάντες μὲν πᾶσι καὶ ἐκκομῶν τὸ σῶμα. But as
 for Julian, μῖμος γὰρ οὐκ ἦν αὐτὸν, καὶ τοῖς ἀπὸ τῆς χιλιῆς αἰχμῆς ἀπεμνηστέον... ἔως ἡ Ταραίων αὐτὸν ἰσχυρῶς πῶς...
 ἔνθα δὲ οἱ τιμῶν ἀπαιτῶν, καὶ τὰς ἐξάρχουσας καὶ ἀποκρίπτεται, καὶ ἔστι δὲ αὐτῶν εὐσεβῶν ὁμοίαν. Solutio, 2.

Thus I believe the onely-begotten and eternal Son of God, for the confirmation of the truth of his death already past, and the verity of his resurrection from the dead suddenly to follow, had his body, according to the custom of the Jews, prepared for a funeral, bound up with linen clothes, and laid in spices; and after that accustomed preparation, deposited in a Sepulchre hewn out of a rock, in which never man was laid before, and by rolling of a stone unto the door thereof, entombed there. Thus I believe that Christ was buried.

ARTICLE V.

*He descended into Hell: the third day he rose again
from the dead.*

THe former part of this Article, of the *Descent into Hell*, hath not been so † anciently in the Creed, or so universally, as the rest. The first place we find it used in was the Church of *Aquileia*; and the time we are sure it was used in the Creed of that Church was less than 400 years after *Christ*. After that it came into the * *Roman Creed*, and ∴ others, and hath been acknowledged as a part of the Apostles Creed ever since.

† First, it is to be observed, that the Descent into Hell was not in the ancient Creeds or Rules of Faith. Some

tell us that it was not in the Confession of *Ignatius*, *Ep. ad Magnif.* But indeed there is no Confession of Faith in that Epistle; for what is read there was thrust in out of *Clemens* his Constitutions. In the like manner, it is again objected that it was omitted by *Polycarp*, *Clemens Romanus*, and *Justin Martyr*, because they have not pretended any Rule of Faith or Creed of their times. But that which is material in this cause, It is not to be found in the Rules of Faith delivered by *Irenaeus*, lib. 1. cap. 2. by *Origen* lib. 2. c. 29. in *proem.* or by *Tertullian* adv. *Praxeam*, cap. 2. de *Virg. veland.* cap. 1. de *Præscript. adv. Hæret.* cap. 13. It is not expressed in those Creeds which were made by the Councils as larger explications of the Apostles Creed: not in the *Nicene* or *Constantinopolitane*; not in that of *Ephesus*, or *Chalcedon*; not in those Confessions made at *Sardica*, *Antioch*, *Seleucia*, *Sirmium*, &c. It is not mentioned in several Confessions of Faith delivered by particular persons: not in that of *Eusebius Caesariensis*, presented to the Council of *Nice*, *Theodoret*, l. 1. c. 2. not in that of *Marcellus* Bishop of *Ancyra*, delivered to *Pope Julius*, *Epiphani.* Hæret. 72. not in that of *Arius* and *Enquius*, presented to *Constantine*, *Socrat.* l. 1. c. 19. not in that of *Acacius* Bishop of *Cæsarea*, delivered into the Synod of *Seleucia*, *Socrat.* l. 2. c. 40. not in that of *Eustathius*, *Theophilus* and *Silvanus*, sent to *Liberius*, *Socrat.* l. 4. c. 12. There is no mention of it in the Creed of *S. Basil*, *Traff. de Fide in Asceticis*; in the Creed of *Epiphanius*, in *Ancorato* c. 110. *Gelasius*, *Damasus*, *Macarius*, &c. It is not in the Creed expounded by *S. Cyril*, though some have produced that Creed to prove it:) it is not in the Creed expounded by *S. Augustine* de *Fide & Symbolo*; not in that De *Symbolo ad Catechumenos*, attributed to *S. Augustine*; not in that which is expounded by *Maximus Taurinensis*, nor that so often interpreted by *Petrus Chrysologus*, nor in that of the Church of *Antioch*, delivered by *Cassianus*, de *Incarn.* l. 6. neither is it to be seen in the MSS. Creeds set forth by the learned *Arch-bishop of Armagh*. Indeed it is affirmed by *Ruffinus*, that in his time it was neither in the Roman nor the Oriental Creeds: Sciendum sane est, quod in Ecclesiæ Romanæ symbolo non habetur additum, descendit ad inferna; sed neque in Orientis Ecclesiis habetur hic sermo. *Ruff. in Exposit. Symboli.* It is certain therefore (nor can we disprove it by any acknowledged evidence of antiquity) that the article of the Descent into Hell was not in the Roman or any of the Oriental Creeds.

* That the Descent into Hell came afterwards into the Roman Creed appears, not only because we find it there of late, but because we find it often in the Latine Church many Ages since. As in that produced by *Etherius* against *Elipandus* in the year 785, in the 115 *Serm. de Tempore* falsely ascribed to *S. Augustine*, where it is attributed to *S. Thomas* the Apostle: In the Exposition of the Creed falsely ascribed to *S. Chrysostom*. ∴ As in the Creed attributed to *Athanasius*, which though we cannot say was his, yet we know was extant about the year 600, by the Epistle of *Isidorus Hispalensis* ad *Claudianum Ducem*. It was also inserted into the Creed of the Council of *Ariminum*, *Socr.* l. 2. c. 37. and of the fourth Council of *Toledo*, held in the year 633, and of the sixteenth Council of the same *Toledo*, held in the year 693.

Indeed the *Descent into Hell* hath * always been accepted, but with a various exposition: and the Church of *England* at the Reformation as it received the three Creeds, in two of which this Article is contained, so did it also make this one of the Articles of Religion, to which all who are admitted to any Benefice or received into holy Orders are obliged to subscribe. And at the first reception it was propounded with a certain Explication, and thus delivered in the fourth year of King *Edward* the sixth, with reference to an express place of Scripture interpreted of this Descent: *That the body of Christ lay in the grave untill his Resurrection; but his spirit, which he gave up, was with the spirits which were detained in prison, or in Hell, and preached to them, as the place in S. Peter testifieth.* So likewise after the same manner in the Creed set forth in *Metre* after the manner of a Psalm, and still remaining at the end of the Psalms, the same exposition is delivered in this Staff;

*And so he died in the flesh,
But quickned in the spirit:
His body then was buried,
As is our use and right.*

bantur, fuit, illisque predicavit, ut testatur Petri locus, &c. *Articuli ann. 1552.* which place was also made use of in the Exposition of the Creed contained in the Catechism set forth by the Authority of King *Edward*, in the seventh year of his reign:

* Quis nã infidelis negaverit fuisse apud inferos Christum? *S. Aug. Ep. 99.*

† 1 *Pet.* 3. 19. Nam corpus usque ad Resurrectionem in sepulchro jacuit Spiritus ab illo emissus cum spiritibus qui in Carcere, sive in Inferno deinceps

*His spirit did after this descend
Into the lower parts,
Of them that long in darkness were
The true light of their hearts.*

Article. 3.
1552.

But in the Synod ten years after, in the days of Queen *Elizabeth*, the Articles, which continue still in force, deliver the same Descent, but without any the least explication or reference to any particular place of Scripture, in these words; *As Christ died for us and was buried, so also it is to be believed that he went down into Hell.* Wherefore being our Church hath not now imposed that interpretation of S. Peter's words, which before it intimated; being it hath not delivered that as the onely place of Scripture to found the *Descent into Hell* upon; being it hath alleged no other place to ground it, and delivered no other explication to expound it: we may with the greater liberty pass on to find out the true meaning of this Article, and to give our particular judgment in it, so far as a matter of so much obscurity and variety will permit.

First then, it is to be observed, that as this Article was first in the *Aquileian* Creed, so it was delivered there not in the express and formal term of *Hell*, but in such a word as may be capable of a greater latitude, *Descendit in inferna*: which words as they were continued in † other Creeds, so did they find a double interpretation among the *Greeks*; some translating *inferna* *Hell*, others the * *lower parts*: the first with relation to S. Peter's words of *Christ*, *Thou wilt not leave my soul in Hell*; the second referring to that of S. Paul, *He descended into the lower parts of the earth*.

† Descendit
in inferna, or
ad inferna, is
the general
writing in the
ancient MSS.
as the learned
Arch-bishop

testifieth of those in the *Benedictine* and *Cottonian* Libraries; to which I may add those in the Library at *Westminster*: we see the same likewise in that of *Elipandus*, *Descendit ad inferna*. which words are so recited in the Creed delivered in the *Catechism* set forth by the Authority of *Edward* the 6. A. D. 1553.

* So the ancient MS. in *Bennet* College Library, *καταβύττα εἰς τὰ κατωτάτα*, or *Descendit ad infernum*, as *Venantius Fortunatus*. For *τὰ κατωτάτα* is a fit interpretation, if we take *inferna* according to the *Vulgar* Etymology; as S. *Augustine*, *Inferi*, eo quod infra sint, Latine appellantur, *De Gen. ad lit. l. 12. c. 24.* or as *Notinus Marcellus*, *Inferum* ab imo dictum, unde inferi, quibus inferius nihil. Again, *Inferna* may well be translated *ἄδης*, if it be taken according to the true Origination, which is from the Greek *ἄρατος*, with the *ἄλφ* digamma, from which *Dialect* most of the *Latine* language came, *Ἐφ' ἔργῳ*, *Inferi*. Now *ἔρατος*, according to the Greek composition, is nothing else but *καταβύττα*. Etym. *Ἐρεσι*, *εἰ* *ἔρατος*, *κατὰ* *τὴν* *ἔρατος*, *ἡ* *ἔρατος*, *κατὰ* *τὴν* *ἔρατος*. *Ἐρα* is anciently the earth, from whence *ἔρατος*, *κατὰ* *τὴν* *ἔρατος*, to the earth. *ἔρατος* then are in the earth, as they supposed the *Manes* or *Spirits* of the dead to be: from whence *Homer*, *Iliad. 6.* *Ἄδης ἐν ἔρατος ἀνέστη*, of *Pluto*; and *Hesiod*, *Teios* *Ἄδης ἐν ἔρατος ἔλατ' ἐβύβησαν ἀνέστη* and in imitation of them *Aeschylus* in *Persis*, *Ἰντὶ καὶ ἔρατος*, *βασιλεὺς τ' ἔρατος*, *Πάριος* *ἔρατος* *ἔρατος* *εἰς* *ἔρατος*. Thus *ἔρατος* are those which *Aeschylus* elsewhere calls *τὸν* *ἔρατος* *ἔρατος*, *κατὰ* *τὴν* *ἔρατος*. And as *ἔρατος*, the *Souls* of the dead in the earth, so are *Inferi* in the first acception, that is, *Manes*. *Pomponius Mela*, *Augilæ manes tantum Deos putant*; which *Pliny* delivers thus, *Augilæ inferos tantum colunt*; and *Solinus*, *Augilæ vero solos colunt inferos*. *Inferi* were then first *ἔρατος* the *Souls* of men in the earth: and as *Manes* is not onely that for the *Souls* below, but also for the place, as in the Poet,

Manesque profundi,
Hæc Manes veniat mihi fama sub imos;

so *Inferi* is most frequently used for the place under ground where the *Souls* departed are: and the *inferna* must then be those regions in which they take up their habitations. And so *Descendit ad inferna*, *καταβύττα εἰς ἄδης*, and *Descendit ad Inferos*, are the same.

* *Acts* 2. 27.

† *Ephes.* 4. 9.

Secondly, I observe that in the *Aquileian* Creed, where this Article was first expressed, there was no mention of *Christ's* Burial; but the words of their Confession ran thus, † *crucified under Pontius Pilate, he descended in inferna*. From whence there is no question but the observation of *Ruffinus*, who first

† So are the
words cited
in *Ruffinus*,
Crucifixus

sub *Pontio Pilato*, descendit in inferna. And his observation upon them is this; *Sciendum sane est, quod in Ecclesiæ Romanæ Symbolo non habetur additum, Descendit ad inferna*; sed neque in *Orientis* Ecclesiis habetur hic sermo: vis tamen verbi eadem videtur esse in eo quod sepulchrum est. *Expos. Symb.* The same may also be observed in the *Athanasian* Creed, which has the *Descent*, but not the *Sepulture*; Who suffered for our Salvation, descended into Hell, rose again the third day from the dead. Nor is this onely observable in these two, but also in the Creed made at *Sirmium*, and produced at *Ariminum*, in which the words run thus, *καταβύττα, καὶ παύττα, καὶ ἀνέστηντα, καὶ εἰς τὰ κατωτάτα κατέβητα*. where though the *Descent* be expressed, and the *Burial*

be not mentioned; yet it is most certain, & of men which make it (Hereticks indeed, but not in this) did not understand his Burial by that Descent: and that appears by addition of the following words, *εἰς τὰ κατὰ θόνα κατεβύτα, καὶ τὰ ἐν ᾧ οἰκονομήσας, ἐν πύλαις αἰς ἰδύμεν ἐρεζαν.* For he did not dispose and order things below by his body in the grave; nor could the keepers of the gates of Hell be affrighted with any sight of his corps lying in the pulchre.

expounded it, was most true, that though the *Roman* and *Oriental* Creeds had not their words, yet they had the sense of them in the word *buried*. It appeareth therefore that the first intention of putting these words in the Creed was onely to express the Burial of our Saviour, or the descent of his body into the grave. But although they were first put in the *Aquileian* Creed to signify the Burial of *Christ*, and those which had onely the Burial in their Creed did confess as much as those which without the Burial did express the Descent; yet since the *Roman* Creed hath added the Descent unto the Burial, and expressed that Descent by words signifying more properly *Hell*, it cannot be imagined that the Creed as now it stands, should signify onely the Burial of *Christ* by his Descent into Hell. But rather, being the ancient Church did certainly believe that *Christ* did some other way descend beside his Burial; being though he interpreted those words of the Burial onely, yet in the relation of what was done at our Saviour's death he makes mention of his Descent into Hell, beside, and * distinct from, his Sepulture; being those who in after-Ages added it to the Burial did actually believe that the Soul of *Christ* descended: it followeth that, for the Exposition of the Creed, it is most necessary to declare in what that Descent consisteth.

* For having produced many places of Scripture to prove the

Circumstances of our Saviour's death, and having cited those particularly which did belong unto his Burial, he passes farther to his Descent, in these words, Sed & quod in infernum descendit, evidenter prænuntiatur in Psalmis, ubi dicit, Et in pulverem mortis deduxisti me; & iterum, Quæ utilitas in sanguine meo dum descendo in corruptionem? & iterum, Descendisti in limum profundi, & nunc es substantia. Sed & Mattheus dicit, Tu es qui venturus es, au alium expectamus? Unde & Petrus dixit, Quia Christus mortificatus carne, vivificatus autem spiritu. In ipso, ait, & eis qui in carcere inclusi erant in diebus Noe: in quo etiam quid operis egerit in inferno declaratur. Sed & ipse Dominus per Prophetam dicit tanquam de futuro, Quia non derelinques animam meam in inferno, nec dabis sanctum tuum videt corruptionem: quod rursus propheticè nihilominus ostendit impletum, cum dicit, Domine, eduxisti ab inferno animam meam, salvasti me à descendentibus in lacum. Where it appeareth, that though *Ruffinus* thought that the sense of descendit ad inferna was expressed in sepultus est; yet he did distinguish the Doctrine of *Christ*'s Descent into Hell from that of his Burial.

Thirdly, I observe again, that whatsoever is delivered in the Creed we therefore believe because it is contained in the Scriptures, and consequently must so believe it as it is contained there; whence all this exposition of the whole is nothing else but an illustration and proof of every particular part of the Creed by such Scriptures as deliver the same, according to the true interpretation of them and the general consent of the Church of God. Now these words as they lie in the Creed, *he descended into Hell*, are no-where formally and expressly delivered in the Scriptures; nor can we find any one place in which the Holy Ghost hath said in express and plain terms that *Christ* as he died and was buried, so *he descended into Hell*. Wherefore being these words of the Creed are not formally expressed in the Scripture, our enquiry must be in what Scriptures they are contained virtually; that is, where the Holy Ghost doth deliver the same Doctrine, in what words soever, which is contained, and to be understood in this expression, *He descended into Hell*.

Now several places of Scripture have been produced by the Ancients as delivering this truth, of which some without question prove it not: but three there are which have been always thought of greatest validity to confirm this Article. First, that of *S. Paul* to the *Ephesians* seems to come very near the words themselves, and to express the same almost in † terms: * Now

† For the first expression which we find in *Ruffinus*, Descendit in inferna, comes most near to this notation; especially if we take the ancient Greek Translation of it, κατεβύτα εἰς τὰ κατώτατα. For if we consider that κατώτατα may well have the signification of the superlative, especially being the LXX hath so translated Psal. 63. 9. εἰσαβύσσον εἰς τὰ κατώτατα & γῆς and Ps. 139. 15. ὅτι ἡ καταστάσις μου ἐν τοῖς κατωτάτοις & γῆς what can be nearer to these two, κατεβύτα εἰς τὰ κατώτατα, and κατεβύτα εἰς τὰ κατώτατα; or these two, κατεβύτα εἰς τὰ κατὰ θόνα, and, κατεβύτα εἰς τὰ κατώτατα; μὴν & γῆς; * Eph. 4. 9.

G g 2

that

that he ascended, what is it but that he descended first into the lower parts of the earth? This many of the ancient Fathers understood of the Descent into Hell, as placed in the lowest parts of the earth: and this exposition must be confessed so probable, that there can be no argument to disprove it. Those lower parts of the earth may signifie Hell, and Christ's descending thither may be, that his Soul went to that place when his body was carried to the grave. But that it was actually so, or that the Apostle intended so much in those words, the place it self will not manifest. For we cannot be assured that the descent of Christ which S. Paul speaketh of was performed after his death; or if it were, we cannot be assured that the lower parts of the earth did signifie Hell, or the place where the Souls of men were tormented after the separation from their bodies. For as it is written, *No man ascendeth up to heaven, but he that descended from heaven*; so this may signifie so much, and no more, *In that he ascended, what is it but that he descended first*? And for the lower parts of the earth, they may possibly signifie no more then the place beneath: as when our Saviour said, *Ye are from beneath, I am from above; ye are of this world, I am not of this world*: or as God spake by the Prophet, *I will shew wonders in heaven above, and signs in the earth beneath*. Nay, they may well refer to his Incarnation, according to that of David, *My substance was not hid from thee when I was made in secret, and curiously wrought in the lower parts of the earth*; or to his Burial, according to that of the Prophet, *Those that seek my soul to destroy it shall go into the lower parts of the earth*: and these two references have a great similitude, according to that of Job, *Naked came I out of my mother's womb, and naked shall I return thither*.

scelus unus est, neque alius est Christus mortuus, alius sepultus, aut alius descendens ad inferna, & alius ascendens in caelos, secundum illud Apostoli, *Ascendit autem quid est, &c.* De Trinit. l. 10. * John 3. 13. * John 8. 23.
 * Psal. 139. 15. * Psal. 63. 9. * Job 1. 21.

The next place of Scripture brought to confirm the Descent is not so near in words, but thought to signifie the end of that Descent, and that part of his Humanity by which he descended. For Christ, saith S. Peter, was put to death in the flesh, and quickned by the spirit, by which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison: where the Spirit seems to be the Soul of Christ; and the spirits in prison, the Souls of them that were in Hell, or in some place at least separated from the joys of Heaven: whither because we never reade our Saviour went at any other time, we may conceive he went in spirit then when his Soul departed from his body on the Cross. This did our Church first deliver as the proof and illustration of the Descent, and the ancient Fathers did apply the same in the like manner to the proof of this Article. But yet those words of S. Peter have no such power of probation; except we were certain that the spirit there spoken of were the Soul of Christ, and that the time intended for that preaching were after his death, and before his resurrection. Whereas if it were so interpreted, the difficulties are so many, that they * staggered S. Augustine, and caused him at last to think that these words of S. Peter belonged not unto the doctrine of Christ's descending into Hell. But indeed the spirit by which he is said to preach was not the Soul of Christ, but that Spirit by which he was quickned; as appeareth by the coherence of the words, being

† As Hermes l. 3. Simil. 9. Irenaeus l. 4. c. 45. Clem. Alex. Strom. l. 6. Orig. Hom. 35. in Matt. S. Athanas. l. de Incarn. & Epist. ad Epictetum, Epiph. Hares. 77. S. Cyril. de recta fide ad Theodosium, l. 11. in Jo-

hannem, Orat. Pasch. & alibi saepius. Author. Comment. Ambros. script. ad Rom. 10. Raff. in Explic. Symb. * For in his Answer to Euodius, Ep. 99. he thus begins, Quæstio quam mihi proposuisti ex Epistola Apostoli Petri solet nos, ut te latere non arbitror, vehementissime commovere, quomodo illa verba accipienda sint tanquam de inferis dicta. Repleo ergo tibi eandem quæstionem, ut siue ipse potueris, siue aliquem qui possit inveneris, auferas de illa atque finias dubitationem meam. Tota sitting down in order all the difficulties which occurred at that time in that Exposition of the Descent into Hell, he concludes with an Exposition of another nature: Considera tamen, ne forte totum illud quod de conclusis in carcere spiritibus qui in diebus Noe non crediderant Petrus Apostolus dicit, omnino ad inferos non pertinere, sed ad illa potius tempora quorum formam ad hæc tempora transtulit.

put to death in the flesh, but quickned by the spirit, by which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison. Now that Spirit by which *Christ* was quickned is that by which he was raised from the dead, that is, the power of his Divinity; as *S. Paul* expresseth it, * *Though he was crucified through weakness, yet he liveth by the power of God:* in respect of which he preached to those which were disobedient in the days of *Noah*, as we have . . already shewn.

Quid est enim quod vivificatus est Spiritu, nisi quod eadem caro quæ solâ fuerat mortificatus, vivificante spi-

ritu resurrexit? Nam quod fuerat animâ mortificatus *Jesus*, hoc est, eo Spiritu qui hominis est, quis audeat dicere? cum mors animæ non sit nisi peccatum, à quo illè omnino immunis fuit cum pro nobis carne mortificaretur. *S. Aug. Epist. 99. Et ibid.* Certe anima *Christi* non solum immortalis secundum cæterarum naturam, sed etiam nullo mortificata peccato vel damnatione punita est; quibus duabus causis mors animæ intelligi potest, & ideo non secundum ipsam dici potuit *Christus vivificatus Spiritu*. In ea re quippe vivificatus est in qua fuerat mortificatus. Ergo de carne dictum est: ipsa enim revixit anima redeunte, quia ipsa erat mortua anima recedente. Mortificatus ergo carne dictus est, quia secundum solam carnem mortuus est: vivificatus autem Spiritu, quia illo Spiritu operante in quo ad quos (*leg. eos*) veniebat & prædicabat, etiam ipsa caro vivificata surrexit, in qua modo ad homines venit. * 2 Cor. 13. * Pag. 112.

The third, but principal, Text is that of *David*, applied by *S. Peter*. For *David* speaketh concerning him, *I foresaw the Lord always before my face; for he is on my right hand, that I should not be moved. Therefore did my heart rejoice, and my tongue was glad: moreover also my flesh shall rest in hope. Because thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine holy one to see corruption.* Thus the Apostle repeated the words of the *Psalmist*, and then applied them: He being a Prophet, and seeing this before, spake of the resurrection of *Christ*, that his soul was not left in hell, neither his flesh did see corruption. Now from this place the Article is clearly and infallibly deduced thus: If the Soul of *Christ* were not left in Hell at his Resurrection, then his Soul was in Hell before his Resurrection: But it was not there before his Death; therefore upon or after his Death, and before his Resurrection, the Soul of *Christ* descended into Hell; and consequently the Creed doth truly deliver that *Christ*, being crucified, was dead, buried, and descended into Hell. For as his flesh did not see corruption by virtue of that promise and propheticall expression, and yet it was in the grave, the place of corruption, where it rested in hope untill his Resurrection: so his Soul, which was not left in Hell, by virtue of the like promise or prediction, was in that Hell, where it was not left, untill the time that it was to be united to the body for the performing of the Resurrection. We must therefore confess from hence that the Soul of *Christ* was in Hell; and no Christian can deny it, saith *S. Augustine*, * it is so clearly delivered in this Prophecie of the *Psalmist* and application of the Apostle.

* Domini quidem carne mortificati, cum venisset in infernum satis

constat. Neque enim contradici potest vel prophetiæ quæ dicit, *Quoniam non derelinques animam meam in Inferno*, (quod ne aliter quisquam sapere auderet, in Actibus Apostolorum idem *Petrus* exponit) vel ejusdem *Petri* illis verbis quibus cum asserit solus esse *Inferni dolores*, in quibus impossibile erat eum teneri. Quis ergo nisi infidelis negaverit fuisse apud inferos *Christum*? *Epist. 99.*

The onely Question then remains, not of the truth of the Proposition, but the sense and meaning of it. It is most certain that *Christ* descended into Hell, and as infallibly true as any other Article of the Creed: but what that Hell was, and how he descended thither, being once questioned, is not easily determined. Different opinions there have been of old, and of late more different still, which I shall here examine after that manner which our subject will admit. Our present design is an Exposition of the Creed as now it stands, and our endeavour is to expound it according to the Scriptures in which it is contained. I must therefore look for such an explication as may consist with the other parts of the Creed, and may withall be conformable unto that Scripture upon which the truth of the Article doth rely: And consequently, whatsoever Interpretation is either not true in it self, or not consistent with the body of the Creed, or not conformable to the Doctrine of the

Apostle in this particular, the Expofitor of that Creed by the Doctrine of the Apostle must reject.

First then, we shall confider the Opinion of *Durandus*, who, as often, fo in this, is fingular. He fupposeth this Defcent to belong † unto the Soul, and the name of *Hell* to fignifie the place where the Souls of dead men were in custody : but he maketh a metaphor in the word *descended*, as not fignifying any local motion, nor inferring any real prefence of the Soul of *Chrift* in the place where the Souls of dead men were; but onely including a virtual motion, and inferring an efficacious prefence, by which Defcent the effects of the Death of *Chrift* were wrought upon the Souls in *Hell* : and becaufe the merit of *Chrift's* Death did principally depend upon the act of his Soul, therefore the effect of his Death is attributed to his Soul as the principal agent; and confequently *Chrift* is truly faid at the instant of his death to *descend into Hell*, becaufe his death was immediately efficacious upon the Souls detained there. This is the opinion of *Durandus*, fo far as it is diftinct from others.

† Cam Articulus fit, Christum ad Inferos descendisse, & non possit intelligi ratione Divinitatis, secundum quam est ubique; nec ratione corporis, secundum quod fuit in sepulchro; restat quod intelligatur ratione animæ: quo supposito, videndum est qualiter anima Christi descendit ad infernum. *Durand. lib. 3. dist. 22. q. 3.*

But although a virtual influence of the death of *Chrift* may be well admitted in reference to the Souls of the dead, yet this Opinion cannot be accepted as the Exposition of this Article; being neither the Creed can be thought to speak a language of fo great Scholastick subtilty, nor the place of *David* expounded by *S. Peter* can poffibly admit any fuch explication. For what can be the fense of those words, *thou shalt not leave my soul in hell*, if his being in *Hell* was onely virtually acting there? If the efficacie of his death were his Defcent, then is he descended still, becaufe the effect of his death still remaineth. The Opinion therefore of *Durandus*, making the Defcent into *Hell* to be nothing but the efficacie of the death of *Chrift* upon the Souls detained there, is to be rejected, as not expofitive of the Creed's confession, nor confifistent with the Scripture's expreffion.

† Calvia Infit. l. 2. c. 16. § 10. Si Christus ad inferos descendisse dicitur, nihil mirum est, cum eam mortem pertulerit quæ sceleribus ab irato Deo infligitur: which be expresth presently in another phrase, cum diros in anima cruciatus damnati ac perditū hominis pertulerit.

The next Opinion, later then that of *Durandus*, is, that the † Defcent into *Hell* is the fuffering of the torments of *Hell*; that the Soul of *Chrift* did really and truly fuffer all those pains which are due unto the damned; that whatsoever is threatned by the Law unto them which depart this life in their fins and under the wrath of God, was fully undertaken and born by *Chrift*; that he died a true and natural death, the death of *Gehenna*, and this dying the death of *Gehenna* was the *descending into Hell*; that those which are now faved by virtue of his death should otherwise have endured the same torments in *Hell* which now the damned do and shall endure, but that he, being their surety, did himself fuffer the same for them, even all the torments which we should have felt, and the damned shall.

This Interpretation is either taken in the strict fense of the words, or in a latitude of expreffion; but in neither to be admitted as the Exposition of this Article. Not if it be taken in a strict, rigorous, proper and formal fense; for in that acception it is not true. It must not, it cannot, be admitted that *Chrift* did fuffer all those torments which the damned fuffer; and therefore it is not, it cannot, be true, that by fuffering them he descended into *Hell*. There is a worm that never dieth which could not lodge within his breast, that is, a remorse of Conscience feated in the Soul for what that Soul hath done : but fuch a remorse of Conscience could not be in *Chrift*, who though

Quid igitur? Christus personā suā secundum humanitatem poenam gehennalem nobis debitam passus est, animā principaliter, corpore secundario, utroque casualiter ad merendum, ad nos suo ipsius merito liberandos. *Parkerus de Descensu, l. 3. § 48. Et statim § 49. Descendisse namque Servatorem, modo supra memorato, ad Haden mortis gehennalis, innumeris patet argumentis.*

he

he took upon himself the sins of those which otherwise had been damned, yet that act of his was a most vertuous, charitable, and most glorious act, highly conformable to the will of God, and consequently could not be the object of remorse. The grief and horreur in the Soul of *Christ*, which we have expressed in the explication of his sufferings antecedent to his Crucifixion, had reference to the sins and punishment of men, to the justice and wrath of God; but clearly of a nature different from the sting of Conscience in the Souls condemned to eternal flames. Again, an essential part of the torments of Hell is a present and constant sense of the everlasting displeasure of God, and an impossibility of obtaining favour, and avoiding pain; an absolute and compleat despair of any better condition, or the least relaxation: But *Christ*, we know, had never any such resentment, who looked upon the reward which was set before him, even upon the Cross, and offered up himself a sweet-smelling sacrifice; which could never be efficacious, except offered in Faith. If we should imagine any damned Soul to have received an express promise of God, that after 10000 years he would release him from those torments, and make him everlastingly happy, and to have a true faith in that promise, and a firm hope of receiving eternall life; we could not say that man was in the same condition with the rest of the damned, or that he felt all that Hell which they were sensible of, or all that pain which was due unto his sins: because hope and confidence and relying upon God would not onely mitigate all other pains, but wholly take away the bitter anguish of despair. *Christ* then, who knew the beginning, continuance, and conclusion of his Sufferings, who understood the determinate minute of his own Death and Resurrection, who had made a Covenant with his Father for all the degrees of his Passion, and was fully assured that he could suffer no more then he had freely and deliberately undertaken, and should continue no longer in his Passion then he had himself determined, he who by those torments was assured to overcome all the powers of Hell, cannot possibly be said to have been in the same condition with the damned, and strictly and properly to have endured the pains of Hell.

Again, if we take the torments of Hell in a Metaphorical sense, for those terrours and horrors of Soul which our Saviour felt, which may therefore be called infernall torments, because they are of greater extremity then any other tortures of this life, and because they were accompanied with a sense of the wrath of God against the unrighteousness of men; yet this cannot be an Interpretation of the Descent into Hell, as it is an Article of the Creed, and as that Article is grounded upon the Scriptures. For all those pains which our Saviour felt (whether, as they pretend, properly infernal, or metaphorically such) were antecedent to his death; part of them in the Garden, part on the Cross; but all before he commended his spirit into the hands of his Father, and gave up the Ghost. Whereas it is sufficiently evident that the Descent into Hell, as it now stands in the Creed, signifieth something commenced after his death, contra-distinguished to his Burial; and, as it is considered in the Apostle's explication, is clearly to be understood of that which immediately preceded his Resurrection; and that also grounded upon a confidence totally repugnant to infernal pains. For it is thus particularly expressed: *I foresaw the Lord always before my face; for he is on my right hand, that I should not be moved. Therefore did my heart rejoyce, and my tongue was glad; moreover also my flesh shall rest in hope: because thou wilt not leave my soul in hell.* Where the faith, hope, confidence and assurance of *Christ* is shewn, and his flesh, though laid in the grave, the place of corruption, is said to *rest in hope*, for this very reason because God would not leave his soul in hell. I conclude there-

שְׁאוֹל, כִּי אֶרֶץ אֲדָמָה, כִּי אֶרֶץ אֲדָמָה, which we translate, For I will go down into the grave unto my son mourning, upon the authority of the ancient Targums. For although that of Onkelos keep the original word לשֹׂאֵל; yet the Jerusalem Targum and that of Jonathan render it לְבֵי קְבוּרָתָא, in domum sepulchri; and the Persian Targum, to the same purpose, בְּנוֹר, as also the Arabic Translation, Imo descendam ad pulverem meum de filio meo. So Gen. 42. 38. וְהוֹרַדְתִּי אֶת שֵׁבֶטִי בִּגְנוֹן שְׁאוֹל, καὶ καταξερῶ τὸ γένος μου ἄδμος εἰς ἄδου, which we translate, Then shall ye bring down my gray hairs with sorrow to the grave: where the Jerusalem Targum and that of Jonathan have it again לְבֵי קְבוּרָתָא; and the Persian again בְּנוֹר, in sepulchrum; the Arabic, أَلَى أَلْتَرَى, ad pulverem, or ad terram. And it is observed by the Jewish Commentators, that those Christians who interpret those words spoken by Jacob, I will go down into Sheol, of Hell, declaring that Sheol there is nothing else but the grave. Gen. 37. 35. 42. 38. 1 Sam. 2. 6.

Now being the *Soul* is sometimes taken for the body deserted by the Soul, and *Hell* is also sometimes taken for the Grave, the receptacle of the body dead; therefore it is conceived that the Prophet did intend these significations in those words, *Thou shalt not leave my soul in hell*; and consequently, the Article grounded on that Scripture must import no more then this, *Christ* in respect of his body bereft of his Soul, which was recommended into and deposited in the hands of his Father, *descended into the grave*.

This Exposition hath that great advantage, that he which first mentioned this Descent in the Creed did interpret it of the Buriall; and where this Article was expressed, there that of the Buriall was omitted. But notwithstanding those advantages, there is no certainty of this Interpretation: First, because * he which did so first interpret it, at the same time, and in the tenure of that expression, did acknowledge a descent of the Soul of *Christ* into Hell; and those other † Creeds which did likewise omit the Buriall, and express the Descent, did shew that by that Descent they understood not that of the body, but of the Soul. Secondly, because they which put these words into the *Roman* Creed, in which the Buriall was expressed before, must certainly understand a Descent distinct from that; and therefore though it might perhaps be thought a probable interpretation of the words of *David*, especially taken as belonging to *David*, yet it cannot pretend to an Exposition of the Creed, as now it stands.

* *Raffians*, who first mentioned this Article, did interpret it of the grave, as we have already observed; but yet he did believe a Descent distinct from that, in the Exposition of the Creed:

Sed & quod in infernum descendit, evidenter pronuntiatur in Psalmis, &c. and then citing that of S. Peter, Unde & Petrus dixit, Quia Christus mortificatus carne, vivificatus autem spiritu, In ipso, ait, &c. eis qui in carcere incluserant in diebus Noe; in quo etiam quid operis egerit in inferno declaratur, as we before more largely cited the same place. † I shewed before, that in the Creed made at Sirminum there was the Descent mentioned, and the Buriall omitted, and yet that Descent was so expressed that it could not be taken for the Buriall: besides now I add, that it was made by the Arians, who in few years before had given in another Creed, in which both the Buriall and the Descent were mentioned; as that of Nice in Thracia, καὶ ταφῆναι, καὶ εἰς τὴν καλαχθόνια καταβῆναι, ὃν αὐτὸς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐξηλάσεν; Theodoret. Hist. l. 2. c. 22. and not long after gave in another at Constanti-nople to the same purpose, ταφῶναι, καὶ εἰς τὴν καλαχθόνια καταβῆναι, ὃν αὐτὸς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐξηλάσεν, Socrat. lib. 2. cap. 4.

The next Opinion is, that the Soul may well be understood either for the nobler part of Man distinguished from the body; or else for the person of Man consisting of both Soul and body, as it often is; or for the living Soul as it is distinguished from the immortal spirit: but then the term *Hell* shall signify no place, neither of the man, nor of the body, nor the Soul; but onely the state or condition of men in death during the separation of the Soul from the body. So that the Prophecies shall run thus, *Thou shalt not leave my soul in hell*, that is, Thou shalt not suffer me to remain in the common state of the dead, to be long deprived of my natural life, to continue without exercise, or power of exercising, my vital faculty: And then the Creed will have this sense, that *Christ* was crucified, dead, and buried, and descended into Hell; that is, he went unto the dead, and remained for a time in the state of death, as other dead men do.

But this interpretation supposeth that which can never appear, that *Hades* signifieth not Death it self, nor the place where Souls departed are, but the state and condition of the dead, or their perambulation in death; which is a

H h

Notion

Notion wholly new, and consequently cannot interpret that which representeth something known and believed of old, according to the notions and conceptions of those times. And that this Notion is wholly new, will appear, because not any of the ancient Fathers is produced to avow it, nor any of the Heathen Authours which are produced do affirm it: Nay, it is evident that the *Greeks* did always by *Hades* understand a place into which the Souls of men were carried and conveyed, distinct and separate from that place in which we live; and that their different Opinions shew, placing it some in the Earth, some under it, some in one unknown place of it, some in another. But especially *Hades* in the judgment of the ancient *Greeks* cannot consist in this notion of the state of death, and the permanfion in that condition, because there were many which they believed to be dead, and to continue in the state of death, which yet they believed not to be in *Hades*; as † those who died before their time, and those whose bodies were unburied. Thus likewise the ancient Fathers differed much concerning the place of the *Infernus*; but never any doubted but that it signified some * place or other: and if they had conceived any such notion as the state of death, and the permanfion of the dead in that state, they needed not to have fallen into doubts or questions; the Patriarchs and the Prophets being as certainly in the state of death, and remaining so, as *Corah*, *Dathan*, and *Abiram* are, or any person which is certainly condemned to everlasting flames. Though therefore it be certainly true that *Christ* did truly and properly die, as other men are wont to do, and that after expiration he was in the state or condition of the dead, in deadlihood, as some have learned to speak; yet the Creed had spoken as much as this before, when it delivered that he *was dead*. And although 'tis true that he might have died, and in the next minute of time revived, and consequently his death not (precisely taken) signifie any permanfion or duration in the state of death, and therefore it might be added, *he descended into Hell*, to signifie farther a permanfion or duration in that condition: yet if *Hell* do signifie nothing else but the state of the dead, as this opinion doth suppose, then to *descend into Hell* is no more then to be dead; and so notwithstanding any duration implied in that expreffion, *Christ* might have ascended the next minute after he descended thither, as well as he might be imagined to revive the next minute after he died. Being then to *descend into Hell*, according to this interpretation, is no more then to be dead; being no man ever doubted but that person was dead who died; being it was before delivered in the Creed that *Christ* died, or, as we render it, *was dead*: we cannot imagine but they which did add this part of the Article to the Creed did intend something more then this, and therefore we cannot admit this Notion as a full or proper Exposition.

† The Opinion of the ancient Greeks in this case is excellently expreffed by Tertullian, who shews three kinds of men to be thought not to descend ad inferos when they die; the first Insepulti, the second Aoti, the third Bizothanati. Creditum est, insepultos non ante ad inferos redigi quam iusta perceiverint. De Anima, c. 56. Ajunt & immatura morte preventus eoufque vagari isthic, donec reliquatio compleatur ætatis quacum pervixissent si non tempeftive obiffent. Ibid. Proinde extorres inferum habe-

buntur, quas vi creptas arbitrantur, præcipue per atrocitates suppliciorum; crucis dico & securis, & gladii, & feræ. Ib. The Souls then of those whose bodies were unburied were thought to be kept out of Hades till their funerals were performed; and the Souls of them who died an untimely or a violent death were kept from the same place untill the time of their natural death should come. This he farther expreffes in the terms of the Magicians, whose Art was converfant about Souls departed. Aut optimum est hic retinere secundum ahores, (i.e. aïpov) aut pessimum, secundum Bizothanatos, (Βιζοθανάτοι) ut ipas jam vocabulis utar, quibus auctrix opinionum istarum Magica sonat, Hostanes, & Typhon, & Dardanus, & Damigeron, & Nestabis, & Bernice. Publicæ jam literatura est quæ animas etiam iusta ætate sopitas, etiam proba morte disjunctas, etiam prompta humatione dispunctas, evocaturam se ab inferum incolatu pollicetur. cap. 57. Of that of the Insepulti, he produceth the example of Patroclus: Secundum Homericum Patroclum funus in somnis de Achille flagitantem, quod non alias adire portas inferum possêt, argentibus cum longe animabus sepulcorum. The place he intended is that, Iliad 4.

Θάψετε με, ὅτι τάχα πύλαι αἰδούσθ' ὄψιν.
Τίλ' με εἰργασὼν ψυχῇ, ἀδύλα καμύλων.
Οὐδὲ μὲ πῶς μισγυλῶς ἔσθ' πύλα μ' αἰὲς ἔσθ'.

In the same manner he describes Elpenor, Odyss. 2.

Πρῶτα γ' ἔλυσθ' Ἑλπιδόρῳ ἦλθ' ἐν ἔλπῳ,
Οὐ γὰρ πῶς ἐπιδάσθ' ἐπὶ χθονὸς εὐρυδοῖν.

where it is the observation of Eustathius, "καὶ τὸν ἑλάνος, τὰς τῶν ἀδελφῶν ψυχὰς μὴ ἀναμύγναις. And the same Eustathius observes an extraordinary accuracy in that Question of Penelope concerning Ulysses, upon that same ground; Odyss. d'.

Εἶπε ἔπ' ὧν, ὃ ὄρε' ὀρέομαι ἡλίου.
Ἢ ἔπ' τὴν ἡκίαν, ὃ εἰν αἰδῶο δέμοισιν.

Τὸ δ', καὶ ὄρε' ὀρέομαι ἡλίου, δὲ ὄρε' ὀρεομαι ἐν ὧν δ', καὶ βλέπειν δ'. Οὗτω δ' καὶ τὸ εἰν αἰδῶο δέμοισιν, ὡς ἀνέβηται λόγῳ ἐφ' ἑαυτὸν. καὶ γὰρ ἐν τοῖς ἐξ ἡς διαλογομένου Ἑλλήνων μύθον, ὃ πᾶς πεθνικός καὶ ἐν αἰδῶο γινέσθαι, οἱ μὴ καὶ πύριον ὄρε', καὶ δὲ εὐεπείδ' ἐμπαίνει Πόλυδωρον. ὅτε τὸ, ἢ ἡδὴ τὴν ἡκίαν, καὶ εἰν αἰδῶο δέμοισιν, ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, ἢ ἡδὴ τὴν ἡκίαν καὶ τὴν αἰδῶο. It is here very observable that, according to the opinion of the Greeks, to be dead is one thing, and to be in Hades is another; and that every one which died was not in Hades, ὃ πᾶς πεθνικός καὶ ἐν αἰδῶο γινέσθαι, as Eustathius speaks. Legimus præterea in Sexto, insepulorum animas vagas esse, Serv. in Aeneid. 3. The place which he intended I suppose is this:

Hæc omnis, quam cernis, inops inlumataque turba est;
Portitor ille Chæron; hī quos veluit unda sepulchri.
Nec ripas datur horrendas nec rauca fluentia
Transportare prius quam sedibus ossa quierunt.
Centum errant annos volitantque hæc littora circum.

Thus he is to be understood in the description of the Funeral of Polydorus, Aeneid. 3. Ergo instauramus Polydoro funus, & ingens Aggeritur tumulo tellus, animamque sepulchro Condimus. Not that anima does there signify the body, as some have observed; but that the Soul of Polydorus was then in rest when his body had received funeral rites: as Servius, Legimus præterea in Sexto insepulorum animas vagas esse, & hinc constat non legitime sepulchrum fuisse. Rite ergo reddita legitima sepultura, redit ad quietem sepulchri, saith Servius; or rather, in the sense of Virgil, ad quietem inferni, according to the petition of Palinurus, Sedibus ut saltem placidis in morte quiescam. And that the Soul of Polydorus was so wandering about the place where his body lay unburied, appeareth out of Euripides in Hecuba, where he speaketh thus, Νόν τ' αὖ μιν ποτὶς φάνε' ἔρχεσθαι αἰῶνα, σὺ μὲν ἐρημώσας ἑμὴν, Τεττακὸν ἡδὲ σέξον αἰῶνά μιν. And in the Troades of the same Poet this ἄλν, or erratio vagabunda insepulorum, is acknowledged by the Chorus in these words, ὦ φίλοι, ἃ ποτὶ μοι, Σὺ δ' ἐφ' ἑμὴν ἀλάντ' Ἀδὰμ, ἀνδρῶν. And when their bodies were buried, then their Souls passed into Hades, to the rest. So was it with Polydorus, and that was mentioned in the History of the Philosopher Athenodorus, whose umbra or phasma walked after his death. Inveniuntur ossa inferra cæcenis & implicita, quæ corpus avo terræque putrefactum nuda & exesa reliquerat vinculis: collecta publice sepeliuntur; domus postea rite conditis manibus caruit, Plin. l. 7. Epist. 27. This was the case of the Insepulchri. And for that of the Bizothanati, it is remarkable that Dido threateth Aeneas,

—————sequar atris ignibus absens,
Et cum frigida mors animâ seduxerit artus,
Omnibus umbra locis adero.—————

upon which place Servius observes, Dicunt Physici Biothanatorum animas non recipi in originem suam, nisi vagantes legitimum tempus sati compleverint; quod Poetæ ad sepulturam transferunt, ut, Centum errant annos. Hoc ergo nunc dicit Dido, Occisura me ante diem sum; vaganti mihi dabis pœnas: Nam te persequar, & adero quamdiu erravero semper.

* Ἄλν δ' ὅτι τὸ πᾶν αἰῶνα, ἡγὼν ἀθανάτης καὶ ἀγνώστου, ὃ τὰς ψυχὰς ἡμῶν ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι ἐκδημῶσαι δεχόμεθα. Andreas Capur. in Apocal.

There is yet left another Interpretation grounded upon the general opinion of the Church of Christ in all Ages, and upon a probable exposition of the Prophecies of the Psalmist, taking the Soul in the most proper sense, for the spirit or rational part of Christ; that part of man which, according to our Saviour's doctrine, the Jews could not kill; and looking upon Hell as a place distinct from this part of the world where we live, and distinguished from those Heavens whither Christ ascended, into which place the Souls of men were conveyed after or upon their death: and therefore thus expounding the words of the Psalmist in the person of Christ; Thou shalt not suffer that Soul of mine which shall be forced from my body by the violence of pain upon the Cross, but resigned into thy hands, when it shall go into that place below where the Souls of men departed are detained, I say, thou shalt not suffer that Soul to continue there as theirs have done; but shalt bring it shortly from thence, and re-unite it to my body.

For the better understanding of this Exposition, there are severall things to be observed, both in respect of the matter of it, and in reference to the authority of the Fathers. First therefore, this must be laid down as a certain and necessary truth, that the Soul of man, when he dieth, dieth not, but returneth unto him that gave it, to be disposed of at his will and pleasure; according to the ground of our Saviour's counsel, Fear not them which kill the body, but cannot kill the soul. That better part of us therefore in and after death doth exist and live, either by virtue of its spiritual and immortal nature, as we believe; or at least the will of God, and his power upholding and pre-

serving it from dissolution, as many of the Fathers thought. This Soul thus existing after death, and separated from the body, though of a nature spiritual, is really and truly in some place; if not by way of circumscription, as proper bodies are, yet by way of determination and indistancy, so that it is true to say, this is really and truly present here, and not elsewhere.

Again, the Soul of man, which, while he lived, gave life to the body, and was the fountain of all vital actions, in that separate existence after death must not be conceived to sleep, or be bereft and stript of all vital operations, but still to exercise the powers of understanding and of willing, and to be subject to the affections of joy and sorrow. Upon which is grounded the different estate and condition of the Souls of men during that time of separation; some of them by the mercy of God being placed in peace and rest, in joy and happiness, others by the justice of the same God left to sorrow, pains and misery.

As there was this different state and condition before our Saviour's death, according to the different kinds of men in this life, the wicked and the just, the elect and reprobate: so there were two societies of Souls after death; one of them which were happy in the presence of God, the other of those which were left in their sins, and tormented for them. Thus we conceive the righteous *Abel* the first man placed in this happiness, and the Souls of them, that departed in the same Faith to be gathered to him. Whosoever it was of the sons of *Adam* which first died in his sins was put into a place of torment; and the Souls of all those which departed after with the wrath of God upon them were gathered into his sad society.

Now as the Souls at the hour of death are really separated from the bodies; so the place where they are in rest or misery after death is certainly distinct from the place in which they lived. They continue not where they were at that instant when the body was left without life; they do not go together with the body to the grave; but as the sepulchre is appointed for our flesh, so there is another receptacle, or habitation and mansion for our spirits. From whence it followeth, that in death the Soul doth certainly pass by a real motion from that place, in which it did inform the body, and is translated to that place, and unto that society, which God of his mercy or justice hath allotted to it. And not at present to enquire into the difference and distance of those several habitations, (but for methods sake to involve them all as yet under the notion of the Infernal parts, or the Mansions below,) it will appear to have been the general judgment of the Church that the Soul of *Christ* contradistinguished from his body, that better and more noble part of his Humanity, his rational and intellectual Soul, after a true and proper separation from his flesh, was really and truly carried into those parts below where the Souls of men before departed were detained; and that by such a real translation of his Soul he was truly said to have descended into Hell.

Many have been the Interpretations of the opinion of the Fathers made of late; and their differences are made to appear so great, as if they agreed in nothing which concerns this Point: whereas there is nothing which they agree in more than this which I have already affirmed, the real descent of the Soul of *Christ* unto the habitation of the Souls departed. The persons to whom and end for which he descended, they differ in; but as to a local descent into the infernal parts, they all agree. Who were then in those parts, they could not certainly define; but whosoever were there, that *Christ* by the presence of his Soul was with them they all determined.

That this was the general Opinion of the Church, will appear not only by

by the testimonies of those † ancient Writers which lived successively, and wrote in several Ages, and delivered this exposition in such express terms as are not capable of any other interpretation; but also because it was generally used as an Argument against the *Apollinarian* Heresie: then which nothing can shew more the general opinion of the Catholicks and the Hereticks, and that not onely of the present, but of the precedent Ages. For it had been little less than ridiculous to have produced that for an argument to prove a point in Controversie which had not been clearer then that which was controverted, and had not been some way acknowledged as a truth by both. Now the error of *Apollinarius* was, that *Christ* had no proper intellectual or rational Soul, but that the Word was to him in the place of a Soul: and the * Argument produced by the Fathers for the conviction of this error was, that *Christ* descended into Hell; which the *Apollinarians* could not deny; and that this descent was not made by his Divinity, or by his Body, but by the motion and presence of his Soul, and consequently that he had a Soul distinct both from his flesh and from the Word. Whereas if it could have then been answered by the Hereticks, as now it is by many, that his descent into Hell had no relation to his Soul, but to his body onely, which descended to the grave; or that it was not a real, but onely virtual, descent, by which his death extended to the destruction of the powers of Hell; or that his soul was not his intellectual spirit or immortal Soul, but his living Soul, which descended into Hell, that is, continued in the state of death: I say, if any of these senses could have been affixed to this Article, the *Apollinarians* answer might have been found, and the Catholicks Argument of no validity. But being those Hereticks did all acknowledge this Article: being the Catholick Fathers did urge the same to prove the real distinction of the Soul of *Christ* both from his Divinity and from his Body, because his body was really in the grave when his Soul was really present with the Souls below: it followeth that it was the general Doctrine of the Church, that *Christ* did descend into Hell by a local motion of his Soul, separated from his body, to the places below where the Souls of men departed were.

l. 5. 6. 26.
Cum enim
Dominus in
medio um-
bræ mortis
abierit ubi a-
nimæ mortu-
orum erant,
post deinde
corporaliter
refurrexit...
manifestum
est, quia &
discipulorum
ejus, propter
quos & hæc
operatus est
Dominus, a-
nimæ abi-
bunt in in-
visibilem locum
definitum eis
à Deo, &c.
Clemente Ale-
xandrino
was so clearly
of that opini-
on, that he
thought the
Soul of Christ
preached Sal-
vation to the
Souls in Hell.
Strom. lib. 6.
And Tertulli-
an proves that
the Inferi are
a Cavity in
the earth
where the
Souls of dead
men are, be-
cause the Soul
of Christ went

[illegible]

latus porui reperire. Quod si nusquam in divinis autoritatibus legitur, non utique sinus ille Abrahæ, id est, secretæ cujusdam quietis habitatio, aliqua pars Inferorum fuisse credenda est. Quanquam in his ipsis tanti Magistri verbis, ubi ait disisse Abrahæ, inter eos & nos chaos magnum firmatum est, satis, ut opinor, appareat non esse quandam partem & quasi membrum Inferorum tantæ illius felicitatis sinum. *Epist. 99.*

Now this being the diversity of Opinions anciently in respect of the persons unto whose Souls the Soul of *Christ* descended at his death, the difference of the end or efficacie of that Descent is next to be observed. Of those which did believe the name of *Hades* to belong unto that general place which comprehended all the Souls of men, (as well those which died in the favour of God, as those which departed in their sins) * some of them thought that *Christ* descended to that place of *Hades*, where the Souls of all the faithfull, from the death of the righteous *Abel* to the death of *Christ*, were detained, and there dissolving all the power by which they were detained below, translated them into a far more glorious place, and estated them in a condition far more happy in the Heavens above.

* This is the Opinion generally received in the School; and delivered as the sense of the Church of God in all Ages: but though it were

not so general as the School-men would persuade us, yet it is certain that many of the Fathers did so understand it. *Ὁ μὲν ἐν Κοιτηλῇ τῇ ἐν ᾧ δὲ Ἰουδῶν παύει, ἐν μακρῶν αἰώνων τῷ ἀμείνῳ αὐτῷ θεωρεῖται.* Euseb. de *Demonst. Evang.* l. 10. Κατὰ τὸν οἶον τῆς κατὰ χθονίαν, ἡν καὶ αὐτὸν λυτρώσθαι τὸν δίκαιον. Cyril. catech. 4. *Ἡμεῖς δὲ ἡ θύτης πλεῖον τῆς πάσης τῆς κατὰ χθονίαν, καὶ τῆς κατὰ τὴν ἑσπέραν κατὰ τὴν κατὰ χθονίαν, ἐπὶ τὸ ἐργαστὸν τῷ ἐκείνῳ τῷ θεῷ καὶ τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς πατριάρχαις.* Translated erat Enoc, raptus Elias; sed non est servus supra Dominum. Nullus enim ascendit in cœlum, nisi qui descendit de cœlo. Nam & Moysen, licet corpus ejus non apparuerit in terris, nusquam tamen in gloria cœlesti legimus, nisi postquam Dominus suæ resurrectionis pignore vincula solvit Inferni, & piorum animas elevavit. *S. Ambros. l. 4. de Fide ad Gratianum.* Qui in eo loco detinebantur sancti vinculorum solutionem in Christi adventu sperabant. Nemo enim ab Inferni sedibus liberatur nisi per Christi gratiam. Ed igitur post mortem Christum descendit. Ut Angelus in caminum Babylonis ad tres pueros liberandos descendit, ita Christus ad fornacem descendit Inferni, in quo clausæ iustorum animæ tenebantur. Postquam ed descendit, Inferorum claustra perfodit, diripuit, vastavit, spoliavit, vietas inde animas liberando. *S. Hier. in Ecclesiasten.*

Others of them understood no such translation of place, or alteration of condition there, conceiving that the Souls of all men are † detained below still, and shall not enter into Heaven untill the general Resurrection. They made no such distinction at the death of *Christ*, as if those which believed in a Saviour to come should be kept out from Heaven till he came, and those which now believe in the same Saviour already come should be admitted thither immediately upon their expiration.

† Just. Martyr in his Dialogue with Trypho first begins: *Ἀλλὰ μὲν ἔστιν ἡ ἀποθήκη τῶν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἰουδαίοις*

ἔργον, (ἡμεῖς μὲν οὐδὲν αἰσθάνομεν τοῖς κακοῖς) ἀλλὰ ἡ; τὰς μὲν εὐσεβῶν ἐν κρίσει τοῦ κυρίου ἔσται, τὰς δὲ ἀδίκων ἡ ποινή ἐν κρίσει, ἡ καὶ κείσεται ἐν δολοφονίᾳ χερσὶν τέτι. After him *Irenæus, l. 5. 26.* Cum Dominus in medio umbræ mortis abierit ubi animæ mortuorum erant, post deinde corporaliter resurrexit, & post resurrectionem assumptus est; manifestum est quia & discipulorum ejus, propter quos & hæc operatus est Dominus, animæ abibunt in invisibilem locum definitum eis à Deo, & ibi usque ad resurrectionem commemorantur, sustinentes resurrectionem; post recipientes corpore & perfecte resurgentes, hoc est, corporaliter, quemadmodum & Dominus resurrexit, sic venient in conspectum Dei. Nemo enim est discipulus super magistrum; perfectus autem omnis erit sicut magister ejus. Quomodo ergo Magister noster non statim evolans abiit, sed sustinens definitum à Patre resurrectionis suæ tempus, (quod & per Jonam manifestum est) post triduum resurgens assumptus est; sic & nos sustinere debemus definitum à Deo resurrectionis nostræ tempus prænunciatum à Prophetis, & sic resurgentes assumi, quotquot Dominus hoc dignos habuerit. *Tertullian followeth Irenæus in this particular:* Habes & regionem Inferum subterraneam credere & illos cubito pellere qui satis superbe non putent animas fidelium Inferis dignas, servi super Dominum & discipuli super magistrum, aspernari si forte in Abrahæ sinu expectandæ resurrectionis solatium carpere. *De Anima c. 55.* Nulli patet cœlum terræ adhuc salvæ, ne dixerim clausæ. Cum transactione enim mundi referantur regna cœlorum. *ib.* Eam itaque regionem sinum dico Abrahæ, etsi non cœlestem, sublimiorem tamen Inferis, interim refrigerium præbituram animabus iustorum, donec consummatio rerum resurrectionem omnium plenitudine mercedis expungat. *Adv. Marc. l. 4. c. 34.* Omnes ergo animæ penes Inferos? inquis. Velis & nolis, & supplicia jam illic & refrigeria habes, pauperem & divitem. Cur enim non paties animam & puniri & foveri in Inferis, interim sub expectatione utriusque judicii in quadam usurpatione & candida ejus? *De Anima cap. 58.* *S. Hilary in his Commentary upon these words of the Psalm, Dominus custodiet & introitum tuum & exitum tuum ex hoc & usque in seculum:* Non enim temporis hujus & seculi est ista custodia, non aduri sole atque luna, & ab omni malo conservari; sed futuri boni expectatio est, cum exeuntes de corpore ad introitum illius regni cœlestis per custodiam Domini fideles omnes referantur, in sinu scilicet interim Abrahæ collocati, quod adire impios interjectum Chaos inhiere, quousque introcundi rursum in regnum cœlorum tempus adveniat. Custodit ergo Dominus exitum, dum de corpore exeuntes secreti ab impiis interjecto Chao quiescunt. Custodit & introitum, dum nos in æternum illud & beatum regnum introducit. And at the end of the 2 Psalm, *Judicii enim dies vel beatitudinis retributio est æterna, vel poenæ: tempus vero mortis habet unumquēque suis legibus, dum ad judicium unumquemque aut Abraham reservat aut poena.* Thus Gregory Nyssen still leaves the Patriarchs in Abraham's bosom, in expectation of admittance into Heaven: *Καὶ δὲ οἱ ἐπὶ τῷ Ἀβραάμ πατριάρχῳ τῷ μὲν ἰδὲν τὰ ἐργαζομένους ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ, καὶ οἱ ἀνὰ τὴν ἐκκλήσιν τῶν ἐργαζομένων πατρίδα καλῶς φωνῶν ὁ Ἀβραάμ. ἀλλὰ οἱ μὲν ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ ἐν τῷ κυρίῳ εἰσι, τῷ θεῷ κρείττονι ἐπὶ ἡμῶν οὐρανῶν, καὶ τῷ τῷ Πατρὶ ἐναντίῳ, ἡν καὶ, ἀπὸ, χαρὸς ἡμῶν τῇ κατὰ τὸν νοῦν.* De *Homini Officio, cap. 22.* Those therefore which conceived that the Souls of the Godly now after Christ's ascension

unto the persons of Abraham, where the Patriarchs and Prophets were and are, and that both remain together till the general Resurrection, did not believe that Christ did therefore descend into Hell that he might translate the Patriarchs from thence into Heaven.

But such as thought the place in which the Souls of the Patriarchs did reside could not in propriety of speech be called Hell, nor was ever so named in the Scriptures, conceived, that as our Saviour went to those who were included in the proper Hell, or place of torment, so the end of his Descent was to deliver Souls from those miseries which they felt, and to translate them to a place of Happiness and a glorious condition. They which did think that Hell was wholly emptied, that every Soul was presently released from all the pains which before it suffered, were branded with the names of † Hereticks: but to believe that many were delivered, was both by them and many others counted Orthodox.

† S. August. in his book de Hereticis, reckons this as the seventy

ninth Heretic. Alia descendente ad Inferos Christo credidisse incredulos, & omnes inde existimat liberatos. And though he gives the Heretic without a name, as he found it in Philastrius, yet we find the opinion was not very singular. For Eusebius propounded it to S. Augustine as a question in which he desired satisfaction, an descendens Christus omnibus evangelizavit, omnesque à tenebris & pœnis per gratiam liberavit, ut à tempore resurrectionis Domini iudicium expectetur exinanitis inferis. And in his answer to that question he looks not upon the affirmative part as an Heretic, but as a doubtful proposition. His resolution first is, that it did not coact the Prophets and the Patriarchs, because he could not see how they should be thought to be in Hell, and so capable of a deliverance from thence: Addunt quidam hoc beneficium antiquis etiam Sanctis fuisse concessum, Abel, Seth, Noe, & domui ejus, Abraham, Isaac, & Jacob, aliisque Patriarchis & Prophetis, ut cum Dominus in infernum venisset, illis doloribus solveretur. Sed quoniam modo intelligatur Abraham, in cuius sinum pius etiam pauper ille susceptus est, in illis fuisse doloribus, ego quidem non video: explicant fortasse qui possunt. Epist. 99. ad Eusebium. Et paulo post: Unde illis iustis qui in sinu Abraham erant cum ille in inferna descenderet nondum quid contulisset inveni, à quibus eum secundum beatificam præsentiam suæ Divinitatis nunquam video recessisse. And yet in another place he will not blame them that believed the contrary, nor did he think their opinion absurd. Si enim non absurde credi videtur, antiquos etiam sanctos, qui venturi Christi tenuerunt fidem, locis quidem à tormentis impiorum remotissimis, sed apud Inferos, fuisse, donec eos inde sanguis Christi ad ea loca descensus erueret, &c. De Civ. Dei, l. 20. c. 15. His second Resolution was, that Christ did by his descent relieve some out of the pains of Hell, taking Hell in the worst sense. Quia evidentia testimonia & Infernum commemorant & dolores, nulla causa occurrit cur illuc credatur venisse Salvator, nisi ut ab ejus doloribus salvos faceret. Epist. 99. Quamobrem teneamus firmissime quod fides habet fundatissimæ auctoritate firmata, quia Christus mortuus est secundum Scripturas, & quia sepultus est, & quia resurrexit tertia die secundum Scripturas; & cetera quæ de illo, restante veritate, conscripta sunt. In quibus etiam hoc est, quod apud inferos fuit, solutis eorum doloribus quibus eum erat impossibile teneri; à quibus etiam rectè intelligitur solvisse & liberasse quos voluit. Ibid. His third resolution was, that how many these were which were delivered out of the torments of Hell was uncertain, and therefore temerarious to define. Sed utrum omnes quos in eis invenit, an quosdam quos illo beneficio dignos iudicavit, adhuc requiro. Ibid. Hoc scilicet quod scriptum est, Solutis doloribus Inferi, non in omnibus, sed in quibusdam, accipi potest, quos ille dignos ista liberatione iudicabat: ut neque frustra illuc descendisse existimeretur, nulli eorum profuturus qui ibi tenebantur inclusi; nec tamen sit consequens, ut quod Divina quibusdam misericordia iustitiae concessit, omnibus concessum esse putandum sit. Ibid. Potest & sic, ut eos dolores eum solvisse credamus quibus teneri ipse non poterat, sed quibus alii tenebantur quos ille noverat liberandos. Verum quoniam isti sunt temerarium est definire. Si enim omnes omnino dixerimus tunc esse liberatos qui illic inventi sunt, quis non gratuletur, si hoc possumus ostendere? Ibid. Thus the opinion of S. Augustine is clear, that those which departed in the faith of Christ were before in Happiness and the beatific presence of God, and so needed no translation by the descent of Christ; and of those which were kept in the pains of Hell, some were loosed and delivered from them, some were not: and this was the proper end or effect of Christ's Descent into Hell. Thus Capreolus: Ipse in homine est visitare Inferorum dignatus abstracta, & præpositos mortis præsentia invictæ maiestatis exterruit, & propter liberandos quos voluit, Inferorum portas referari precepit. Epist. ad Hispanos. S. Ambrose: Ipse autem inter mortuos liber remissionem in Inferno positæ soluta mortis lege donabat. De Incarnat. cap. 5. "Ολον δὲ εὐδὸς οὐρανῶν & ἁδῶν, & τὰς ἀπόχους τῆς τῆς κακομυθῶν ἡδονῶν ἀναμάρτας πύλας, ἵνα μὴ ἀποὶς εὐαγγελίου & δόξης ἀνίστην. S. Cyril. Homil. Pasch. 7. Who speaks full as high as those words of Eusebius, or that Heretick, whosoever it was, which is mentioned, though not named, by Philastrius. For ὅσοι & ὅσοι δόξης is as much as Inferi exinanitis; and καὶ τὰς ἀπόχους τῆς τῆς κακομυθῶν (which he useth in another Homily) is the same.

The means by which they did conceive that Christ did free the Souls of men from Hell was the application of his death unto them, which was propounded to those Souls by † preaching of the Gospel there: That as he revealed here on earth the will of God unto the sons of men, and propounded himself as the object of their Faith, to the end that whosoever believed in him should never die; so after his death he shewed himself unto the Souls departed, that whosoever of them would yet accept of and acknowledge him should pass from death to life.

† This preaching of the Gospel to the dead was the general opinion of the Fathers, as the end of his descent or means

by which that good was wrought for the Souls below, which was effected by his death. Ea propter Dominum in ea quæ sub terra descendisse, evangelizantem & illis adventum suum, remissionem peccatorum existentem his qui credunt in eum. Crediderunt autem in eum omnes qui separabant in eum, id est, qui adventum ejus prænuñciaverunt, & dispositionibus ejus servierunt, iusti, & Prophetæ, & Patriarchæ, quibus similiter ut nobis remisit peccata. Irenæus l. 4. c. 45. Ἐν ἑστῇ δὲ ἡμῶν, & ὡς Ζωὴς, &c.

of Scripture to maintain it ; but also to be rejected in it self, as false and inconsistent with the nature, scope and end of the Gospel, (which is to be preached with such commands and ordinances as can concern those onely which are in this life) and as incongruous to the state and condition of those Souls to whom *Christ* is supposed to preach. For if we look upon the Patriarchs, Prophets, and all Saints before departed, 'tis certain they were never *disobedient in the days of Noah* ; nor could they need the publication of the Gospel after the death of *Christ*, who by virtue of that death were accepted in him while they lived, and by that acceptance had received a reward long before. If we look upon them which died in disobedience, and were in torments for their sins, they cannot appear to be proper objects for the Gospel preached. The rich man, whom we find in their condition, desired one might be sent from the dead to preach unto his brethren then alive, lest they also should come unto that place : but we find no hopes he had that any should come from them which were alive to preach to him. For if the living, who *heard not Moses and the Prophets, would not be persuaded though one rose from the dead* ; surely those which had been disobedient unto the Prophets should never be persuaded after they were dead. Luke 16. 31.

Whether therefore we consider the Authorities first introducing this Opinion, which were Apocryphal ; or the testimonies of Scripture, forced and improbable ; or the nature of this Preaching, inconsistent with the Gospel ; or the persons to whom *Christ* should be thought to preach, (which, if dead in the Faith and fear of God, wanted no such instruction ; if departed in infidelity and disobedience, were unworthy and incapable of such a dispensation :) this Preaching of *Christ* to the spirits in prison cannot be admitted either as the end, or as the means proper to effect the end, of his Descent into Hell.

Nor is this Preaching onely to be rejected as a means to produce the effect of *Christ's* Descent ; but the effect it self pretended to be wrought thereby, whether in reference to the just or unjust, is by no means to be admitted. For though some of the Ancients thought, as is shewn before, that *Christ* did therefore descend into Hell, that he might deliver the Souls of some which were tormented in those flames, and translate them to a place of Happiness : yet this opinion deserveth no acceptance, neither in respect of the Ground or Foundation on which it is built, nor in respect of the Action or Effect it self. The Authority upon which the strength of this Doctrine doth rely is that place of the Acts, *whom God hath raised up, loosing the pains of Hell*, for so they read it : from whence the Argument is thus deduced. God did loose the pains of Hell when *Christ* was raised : But those pains did not take hold of *Christ* himself, who was not to suffer any thing after death ; and consequently he could not be loosed from or taken out of those pains in which he never was : in the same manner the Patriarchs and the Prophets and the Saints of old, if they should be granted to have been in a place sometimes called Hell, yet were they there in happiness ; and therefore the delivering them from thence could not be the loosing of the pains of Hell : It followeth then, that those alone which died in their sins were involved in those pains, and when those pains were loosed then were they released ; and being they were loosed when *Christ* was raised, the consequence will be, that he, descending into Hell, delivered some of the damned Souls from their torments there.

† The Vulgar
Latine ver-
dict is thus,
Quem Deus
suscitavit, so-
lucis dolori-
bus inferni:
so also the Sy-
riack, וְשָׂא
חַבְלֵי
רְשָׁיוֹן.

So some of the
ancient Fa-

thers read it: as Irenæus l. 3. c. 12. or rather his Interpreter, Quem Deus excitavit, solucis doloribus inferorum: Capreolus Bishop of Carthage, Resolvete, sicut scriptum est, inferorum parturitiones: And before these Polycarpus, ὁ ἡγέρων ἐκ τῶν, λύ-
σαι τὰς ὁδὸν τῶν ἁδῶν, Quem resuscitavit Deus, dissolvens dolores inferni, Epist. ad Philip. whom I suppose Grotius understood, when he cited Barnabas: and thus S. Augustine read it, and laid the stress of his Interpretation upon this reading, Quia evidentia tes-
timonia & infernum commemorant & dolores, &c. But in the Original Greek it is generally written ὁδὸν τῶν ἁδῶν and in all these many Copies of it, only that of Petrus Fraxardus, and two of the sixteen Copies which Robertus Stephanus made use of, read it ἁδῶν. And this mistake was very easy: for in the eighteenth Psalm, verse the 5. there is חַבְלֵי מוֹת, ὁδὸν τῶν ἁδῶν, and verse the sixth חַבְלֵי שָׁאוֹן, ὁδὸν τῶν ἁδῶν, and we find twice in the Proverbs, 14. 12. and 16. 25. מוֹת מוֹת translated μὴδὲν ἁδῶν, and 2 Sam. 22. 6. חַבְלֵי שָׁאוֹן, ὁδὸν τῶν ἁδῶν. * Quod si mover aliquem, quemadmodum accipiendum sit, Inferni ab illo solutos dolores: (neque enim coeperat in eis esse tanquam in vinculis, & sic eos solvit tanquam si catenas solvisset quibus fuerat alligatus) facile est intelligere, sic eos solutos, quemadmodum solvi possunt laquei venantium, ne teneant, non quia tenuerunt. S. August. Epist. 99.

Matt. 25. 41.
46.
Mark 9. 44.

† This is the
Argument of
Gregory the
Great; Si fi-
deles nunc
sine operibus
bonis non
salvantur, &
infideles ac
reprobi sine
bona actione,
Domino ad
Inferos de-
scendente,
salvati sunt;
melior illo-
rum fors fuit
qui Incarna-
tionem Do-
mini minime
viderunt,
quam horum
qui post In-
carnationis
ejus myste-
rium nati
sunt. Quod
quantæ fatui-
tatis sit dice-
re, ipse Do-
minus testatur, discipulis dicens, Multi Reges & Prophete voluerunt videre quæ vos videtis, & non viderunt. l. 6. Epist. 179.
2 Cor. 5. 10

But first, though the † Latine Translation render it so, the pains of hell; though some Copies and other Translations, and divers of the Fathers, read it in the same manner: yet the Original and authentick Greek acknowledg-
eth no such word as hell, but propounds it plainly thus, whom God hath raised up loosing the pains of death. Howsoever, if the words were so expressed in the Original Text, yet it would not follow that God delivered Christ out of those pains in which he was detained any time, much less that the Soul of Christ delivered the Souls of any other; but * onely that he was preserved from enduring them.

Again, as the Authority is most uncertain, so is the Doctrine most incon-
gruous. The Souls of men were never cast into infernal torments, to be de-
livered from them. The days which follow after death were never made for
opportunities to a better life. The Angels had one instant either to stand or
fall eternally; and what that instant was to them, that this life is unto us. We
may as well believe the Devils were saved, as those Souls which were once
tormented with them. For it is an everlasting fire, an everlasting punishment,
a worm that dieth not. Nor does this onely belong to us who live after the
death of Christ, as if the damnation of all sinners now were ineluctable and
eternall, but before that death it were not so; as if Faith and Repentance
were now indispensably necessary to Salvation, but then were not. For thus
the condition of mankind before the fulness of time, in which our Saviour
came into the world, should have been far more † happy and advantagious
then it hath been since. But neither they nor we shall ever escape eternall
flames, except we obtain the favour of God before we be swallowed by the
jaws of death. * We must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, that eve-
ry one may receive the things done in his body: But if they be in the state of
Salvation now by virtue of Christ's Descent into Hell which were numbred
amongst the damned before his death, at the day of the general Judgment
they must be returned into Hell again; or if they be received then into eter-
nal Happiness, it will follow either that they were not justly condemned to
those flames at first, according to the general dispensations of God, or else
they did not receive the things done in their body at the last; which all
shall as certainly receive, as all appear. This life is given unto men to work
out their Salvation with fear and trembling, but after death cometh judg-
ment, reflecting on the life that is past, not expecting amendment or conver-
sion then. He that liveth and believeth in Christ shall never die; he that
believeth, though he die, yet shall he live; but he that dieth in unbelief shall
neither believe nor live. And this is as true of those which went before, as
of those which came after our Saviour, because he was the Lamb slain before
the foundation of the world. I therefore conclude, that the end for which
the Soul of Christ descended into Hell was not to deliver any damned Souls,
or to translate them from the torments of Hell unto the joys of Heaven.

The

The next consideration is, whether by virtue of his Descent the Souls of those which before believed in him, the Patriarchs, Prophets, and all the people of God, were delivered from that place and state in which they were before; and whether *Christ descended into Hell* to that end, that he might translate them into a place and state far more glorious and happy. This hath been in the later Ages of the Church the vulgar Opinion of most men, and that as if it followed necessarily from the denial of the former; He delivered not the Souls of the damned, † therefore he delivered the Souls of them which believed, and of them alone: Till at last the Schools have followed it so fully, that they deliver it as a point of * Faith and infallible certainty, that the Soul of *Christ* descending into Hell did deliver from thence all the Souls of the Saints which were in the bosome of *Abraham*, and did conferr upon them actual and essential Beatitude, which before they enjoyed not. And this they lay upon two grounds: first, that the Souls of Saints departed saw not God; and secondly, that *Christ* by his death opened the gate of the Kingdom of Heaven.

† So Gregory the Great, after he had proved that none of the damned were released by *Christ's* descent, thus infers and concludes; Hæc itaque omnia pertractantes, nihil aliud

teneatis, nisi quod vera fides per Catholicam Ecclesiam docet; quia descendens ad Inferos Dominus illos solummodo ab Inferni claustris eripuit, quos viventes in carne per suam gratiam in fide & bona operatione servavit. l. 6. Epist. 179. So *Isidore Hispalensis* by way of opposition; Ideo Dominus in Inferno descendit, ut his qui ab eo non penaliter detinebantur viam aperiret revertendi ad celos. So *Venerable Bede* upon the place of *S. Peter*; Catholica fides habet, quia descendens ad Inferna Dominus non incredulos inde, sed fideles tantummodo suos, educens ad celestia secum regna perduxerit; neque exutis corpore animabus & inferorum carcere inclusis, sed in hac vita vel per seipsum, vel per suorum exempla sive verba fidelium, quotidie viam vitæ demonstrat.

* These are the words of *Sanchez* in 3^m *Thoma Disputat.* 43. Sect. 13. Primo ergo, certum est Christum descendendo ad Inferos animabus sanctis, quæ in sinu *Abrahæ* erant, essentialem beatitudinem & cætera animæ dona quæ illam consequuntur contulisse. Hoc de fide certum existimo, quia de fide est illas animas non vidisse Deum ante Christi mortem. Deinde est de fide certum, Christum per mortem aperuisse hominibus janua regni: ideoque de fide etiam certum est, animas Sanctorum omnium post Christi mortem decedentium (si nihil purgandum habeant) statim videre Deum. Ergo idem est de prædictis animabus.

But even this opinion, as general as it hath been, hath neither that consent of Antiquity, nor such certainty as it pretendeth, but is rather built upon the improbabilities of a worse. The † most ancient of all the Fathers, whose writings are extant, were so far from believing that the end of *Christ's* descent into Hell was to translate the Saints of old into Heaven, that they thought them not to be in Heaven yet, nor ever to be removed from that place in which they were before *Christ's* death, untill the general resurrection. Others, as we have also shewn, thought the bosome of *Abraham* was not in any place, which could be termed Hell; and consequently could not think that *Christ* should therefore descend into Hell to deliver them which were not there. And others yet which thought that *Christ* delivered the Patriarchs from their infernal mansions, did not think so exclusively, or in opposition to the disobedient and damned spirits, but conceived many of them to be saved as well as the Patriarchs were, and * doubted whether all were not so saved or no. Indeed I think there were very few (if any) for above 500 years after *Christ*, which did so believe *Christ* delivered the Saints out of Hell, as to leave all the damned there; and therefore this opinion cannot be grounded upon the prime antiquity, when so many of the Ancients believed not that they were removed at all, and so few acknowledged that they were removed alone.

† We have shewed this before to have been the opinion of the most ancient, producing the express testimonies of *Justin Martyr*, *Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, *Hilary*, *Gregory Nyssen*. So also *Novatian* l. de Trinitate, Quæ infra terram jacent, neque ipsa sunt digestis & ordinatis portatibus vacua; Locum enim est quo piorum ani-

ma impiorumque ducantur, futuri judicii præjudicia sentientes.

* We have already shewn that many did believe all the damned souls were saved there; and *S. Augustine* had his adhuc requiro, when he wrote unto *Evodius* concerning that opinion. Briefly, the doubt of that great Divine, *Gregory Nazianzen*, is very observable, who in his Oration de Paschate hath these words, "Αὐτὸς ὁ Χριστὸς οὐρανὸν ἀνοίγει καὶ τοὺς ἐν αἵματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ μυστήρια. τίς ἡ οἰκονομία τῶν πραγμάτων; τίς ὁ λόγος; ἀλλὰ οὐδὲν ἄλλο παρὰ τὸ ἐμπεσεῖν; ἢ καὶ αὐτὸν καὶ τοὺς ἀλλοῦς; Where his question is clearly this, whether *Christ* appearing in hell did save all without exception, or did save there, as he does here, only such as believed. To this it is answered by *Sanchez* two ways, that it is the ordinary and universal law, that none of the damned should be saved: An vero ex speciali privilegio sua voluntate & arbitrio aliquem damnatum ex Gehenna *Christus* eduxerit, dubitari quoquo modo potest. Et juxta hæc possent intelligi *Nazian-*

zenus & Augustinus. But this will by no means salve their authorities; for neither of them did doubt or question whether some of the damned were released, but whether all were released or some only: which Suarez did very well perceive, and therefore was ready in the same sentence with another answer, *Quoniam Nazianzenus non videatur illa scripsisse verba, quoniam de hac veritate dubitaret, sed solum ut proponeret quid de hoc mysterio inquirere ac scire oporteat.* which is as much as to say, that He was satisfied of the truth, but desired to satisfy no man else. Whereas 'tis clear that it was a doubt in his age, as we have before shewn, and that he would leave it still a doubt and undetermined. And as for the other, Augustinus recte potest intelligi de animabus Purgatorii, it is certainly false, unless they will enlarge that Purgatory as wide as Hell; for the question was of emptying that.

And if the Authority of this opinion in respect of its antiquity be not great, the certainty of the truth of it will be less. For first, if it be not certain that the Souls of the Patriarchs were in some place called *hell* after their own death, and untill the death of *Christ*; if the bosome of *Abraham* were not some infernal mansion; then can it not be certain that *Christ* descended into Hell to deliver them. But there is no certainty that the Souls of the just, the Patriarchs and the rest of the people of God, were kept in any place below, which was, or may be called Hell: the bosome of *Abraham* might well be in the heavens above, far from any region where the Devil and his Angels were; the Scriptures no where tell us that the spirits of just men went unto, or did remain in Hell; the place in which the Rich man was in torments after death is called *Hell*, but that into which the Angels carried the poor mans Soul is not termed so. There was a vast distance between them two; nor is it likely that the Angels which see the face of God should be sent down from heaven to convey the Souls of the just into that place where the face of God cannot be seen. When God translated *Enoch*, and *Elias* was carried up in a chariot to heaven, they seem not to be conveyed to a place where there was no vision of God; and yet it is most probable, that *Moses* was with *Elias* as well before as upon the Mount: nor is there any reason to conceive that *Abraham* should be in any worse place or condition then *Enoch* was, having as great a testimony that he pleased God, as *Enoch* had.

Matt. 8. 11.

Luke 13. 28.

Secondly, it cannot be certain that the Soul of *Christ* delivered the Souls of the Saints of old from Hell, and imparted to them the beatifical vision, except it were certain that the Souls are in another place and a better condition now then they were before. But there is no certainty that the Patriarchs and the Prophets are now in another place and a better condition then they were before our blessed Saviour died; there is no intimation of any such alteration of their state delivered in the Scriptures; there is no such place with any probability pretended to prove any actual accession of happiness and glory already past. *Many shall come from the East and West, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob in the Kingdom of heaven;* there then did the Gentiles which came into *Christ* find the Patriarchs, even in the Kingdom of heaven; and we cannot perceive that they found them any where else then *Lazarus* did. For the description is the same, *There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth, when ye shall see Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and all the Prophets in the Kingdom of God, and you yourselves thrust out.* For as the Rich man in hell lift up his eyes being in torments, and seeth *Abraham* afar off, before the death of *Christ*; so those that were in weeping and gnashing of teeth, saw *Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and the Prophets*, when the Gentiles were brought in.

Thirdly, though it were certain that the Souls of the Saints had been in a place called *Hell*, as they were not; though it were also certain that they were now in a better condition then they were before *Christ*'s death, as it is not; yet it would not follow that *Christ* descended into Hell to make this alteration; for it might not be performed before his Resurrection, it might not be effected till his Ascension, it might be attributed to the merit of his Passion, it might have no dependance on his Descension. I conclude therefore that

that there is no certainty of truth in that Proposition which the Schoolmen take for a matter of Faith, That *Christ* delivered the Souls of the Saints from that place of Hell which they call *Limbus of the Fathers*, into heaven; and for that purpose after his death descended into Hell.

Wherefore being it is most infallibly certain that the death of *Christ* was as powerfull and effectual for the Redemption of the Saints before him, as for those which follow him; being *they did all eat the same spiritual meat, and did all drink the same spiritual drink*; being Abraham is the Father of us all, and we now after *Christ's* Ascension are called but *to walk in the steps of the faith* of that Father; being the bosome of Abraham is clearly propounded in the Scriptures as the place into which the blessed Angels before the death of *Christ* conveyed the Souls of those which departed in the favour of God, and is also † promised to them which should believe in *Christ* after his death; being we can find no difference or translation of the bosome of Abraham, and yet it is a comfort still * to us that we shall go to him, and while we hope so never fear that we shall go to hell; I cannot admit this as the end of *Christ's* descent into hell, to convey the Souls of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and those which were with them, from thence; nor can I think there was any reference to such an action in those words, *Thou shalt not leave my soul in hell.*

1 Cor. 10. 3, 4.

Rom. 4. 12.
16.

† Although the Bosome of Abraham is express and formal terms be spoken only of Lazarus, whom *Christ* being yet alive in the flesh supposed dead; yet the

same Bos. me is virtually and in terms equivalent promised to those which afterwards should believe. For the joys of the life to come are likened to a Feast, in which, according to the custom then in use, they lay down with the head of one toward the breast of the other, who is therefore said to lye in his bosome, as we read of S. John, *ὁ ἀνακείμενος ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ Ἰησοῦ*: thus in that heavenly Feast in the Kingdom of God, Lazarus is *ἀνακείμενος ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ Ἀβραάμ*. And in the same Chapter *Christ* saith that, Many shall come from the East and from the West, *καὶ ἀνακείμενοι μετ' Ἀβραάμ*, discumbent cum Abrahamo, sit down with Abraham, as we translate it after our custom, at the same Feast, that is, *ἀνακείμενοι ἐν τοῖς κόλποις τοῦ Ἀβραάμ*, &c. as Euthymius, Quia Deus Abraham, cœli conditor, Pater Christi est; idcirco in regno cœlorum est & Abraham, cum quo accubituræ sunt nationes quæ crediderunt in Christum filium creatoris. S. Augustine often shews the comfort which he had in going to the bosome of Abraham: As in the case of his friend Nebrius, Nunc ille vivit in sinu Abraham. Quicquid illud est quod illo significatur sinu, ibi Nebrius meus vivit, dulcis amicus meus, tuus autem, Domine, adoptivus ex liberto filius ibi vivit. Nam quis alius tali animæ locus? Confess. l. 9. cap. 3. And he seats that place (as uncertain as before) where it was before. Post vitam istam parvam nondum eris ubi erunt Sancti, quibus dicitur, Venite benedicti Patris, percipite regnum quod vobis paratum est ab initio mundi. Nondum ibi eris, quis nescit? Sed jam poteris ibi esse ubi illum quondam ulcerorum pauperem dives ille superbus & sterilis in mediis suis tormentis vidit à longe requiescentem, Concio 1. in Psal. 36. And this he must necessarily take for a sufficient comfort to a dying Christian, who seats that place in conspectu Domini, de Civit. Dei l. 1. c. 12. and looked upon them which were in it, as upon those, à quibus *Christus* secundum beatificam præsentiam nunquam recessit, Epist. 99.

Another Opinion hath obtained, especially in our Church, that the end for which our Saviour descended into Hell, was to triumph over Satan and all the powers below within their own dominions. And this hath been received as grounded on the Scriptures and consent of Fathers. The Scriptures produced for the confirmation of it are these two, *Having spoyled principalities and powers, he made a shew of them openly, triumphing over them*: And, *when he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men*. Now that he ascended, what is it but that he also descended first into the lower parts of the earth. By the conjunction of these two they conceive the triumph of *Christ's* descent clearly described in this manner. Ye were buried with *Christ* in baptism, with whom ye were also raised; and when ye were dead in sins, he quickened you together with him, forgiving your sins, and cancelling the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, and spoiling powers and principalities, he made an open shew of them, triumphing over them in himself. That is, say they, ye died and were buried with *Christ*, who fastned the handwriting of ordinances to the Cross, that he might abolish it, from having any right to tie or yoke his members. Ye likewise were quickened, and raised together with *Christ*, who spoyled powers and principalities, and triumphed over them in his own person. So that these words, *spoiling principalities and powers*, are not referred to the Cross, but to *Christ's* resurrection. This Triumph over Satan

Col. 2. 15.

Eph. 4. 8, 9.
B. Bñfol.
p. 294.
Col. 2. 12, 13.
14, 15.

Prudentius. Dic trophæum passionis, Dic triumphalem cūicem, *Cathem. Hymn.* 10. *S. Hilary* most exp^{ly}, *Manus* ejus easuē ad bellum sunt cūm vicit seculum. *Ego* eam, ait, *vicit* mundum, cūm extensus in crucem invictissimis armis ipsius passionis instruitur. *Et posuisti*, inquit, ut arcum arcum brachia mea, cūm de omnibus virtutibus ac potestatibus in ipso trophæo, gloriosæ crucis triumphat, & principatus & potestates traduit cūm fiducia triumphans in semetipso, in Psalm. 143. *Where it is observable that the Father does read it in semetipso, and interprets it in cruce.* Nos quoniam trophæum jam videmus, & quod curram suum triumphator ascendit, consiJeremus quod non arborum, non quadrijugis plaustrum manubias de mortali hoste quæritas, sed paribulo triumphali capiva de seculo spolia suspendit, *S. Amb.* l. 10. in cap. 23. *S. Lucæ* 3. and amongst the rest of the captives he reckons afterwards, captivum principem mundi, & spiritualia nequitia quæ sunt in cælestibus. *To this alludes Fulgentius* l. 3. ad *Thrasim.* Sic oportuit peccatorum nostrorum chirographum deleri, ut dum vetus homo noster simul cruci affigitur, tanquam in trophæo triumphatoris victoria panderetur. *Whether therefore we read it ἐν αὐτῷ with the Greeks, that is ἐν σαρκί, or ἐν αὐτῷ with the Latines in seipso, it is the same; for he triumphed over the Devil y^e himself upon the Cross, as in the same case it is written Eph. 2. 16.* *ἐν τῷ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ τὸν ἀποστόλου ἐν ἐν σαρκὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ διὰ τῆς σαρκὸς, ἀποκτείναν τὸν ἄρχοντα ἐν αὐτῷ.*

This place then of *S. Paul* to the *Colossians* cannot prove that *Christ descended into Hell*, to triumph over the Devil there; and if it be not proper for that purpose of it self, it will not be more effectual by the addition of that other to the *Ephesians*. For first we have already shewn, that the *descending into the lower parts of the earth*, doth not necessarily signifie his descent into Hell, and consequently cannot prove that either those things which are spoken in the same place, or in any other, are to be attributed to that descent. Again, if it were granted, that those words did signifie *Hell*, and this Article of our Creed were contained in them, yet would it not follow from that Scripture, that *Christ* triumphed over Satan while his Soul was in Hell; for the consequence would be onely this, that the same *Christ* who led captivity captive, *descended first into Hell*. In that he *ascended* (and ascending led captivity captive) *what is it but that he descended first?* the Descent then, if it were to Hell, did precede the triumphant ascent of the same person, and that is all which the Apostles words will evince. Nay further yet, the Ascent mentioned by *S. Paul* cannot be that which immediately followed the Descent into Hell, for it evidently signifieth, the Ascension which followed forty days after his Resurrection. It is not an ascent from the parts below to the surface of the earth, but to the heavens above, an *ascending up on high*, even farr above all heavens. Now the *leading captivity captive* belongeth clearly to this ascent, and not to any descent which did precede it. It is not said, that he *descended first to lead captivity captive*; and yet it must be so, if *Christ* descended into Hell to triumph there; it is not said, when he had led captivity captive, he *ascended up on high*; for then it might be supposed that the captives had been led before: but it is [†] expressly said, *ascending up on high he led captivity captive*; and consequently that triumphant act was the immediate effect of his Ascension. So that by these two Scriptures no more can be proved then this, that *Christ* triumphed over principalities and powers at his death upon the Cross, and led captivity captive at his ascension into Heaven. Which is so far from proving that *Christ* descended into Hell to triumph there, that it is more proper to perswade the contrary. For why should he go to Hell to triumph over them, over whom he had triumphed on the Cross? why should he go to captive that captivity then, which he was to captivate when he ascended into Heaven?

† The Original words doe manifestly shew that this triumphant act did not precede this ascent. For had it been ἀιχμαλωτίζων αἰχμαλωτοὺς ἀνέβη εἰς ὕψος, we might well have expounded it thus, *Christ* did lead sin and death and Satan captive; and when he had done so, ascended up on high: but being it is written ἀνέβη εἰς ὕψος, that is, having ascended up on high, ἡχμαλωτίζων αἰχμαλωτοὺς, he captivated a captivity, the Ascent must here precede the captivation, though not in time (as it did the giving of gifts) yet in nature: so that it is not proper to say, by captivating he ascended; but it is proper to express it thus, by ascending he led captive a captivity.

As for the testimonies of the Fathers, they will appear of small validity to confirm this triumphant Descent as it is distinguished from the two former effects, the removal of the Saints to heaven, and the delivering the damned from the torments of Hell. In vain shall we pretend that *Christ descended into Hell* to lead captivity captive, if we withall maintain, that when he descen-

* So S. Hierome on that place of the Ephesians, Inferiora autem terras infernus accipitur, ad quem Dominus noster Salvatorque descendit, ut Sanctorum animas quæ ibi tenebantur inclusæ, secum ad cælos victor abduceret. And on Mat. 12. 29. Al- ligatus est

fortis, & religatus in Tartarum, & Domini contritus pede; & direptis sedibus Tyranni, captiva ducta est captivitas. So Arnobius Caracallus is to be understood, De unitione Chriftianis, Passus est rex illudi, & vita occidi, descendensque ad inferos, captivam ab antiquo captivitatem reduxit; Applying it to the custom of the Church, Omnino convenit, ut eo tempore quo Chriftus captivos eduxit ab inferis, reconciliari peccatores ad Ecclesiam reducantur, Ibid. Thus Athanasius when he speaks of Chrift's triumphing over Satan in Hell, he mentions τὸν ἄδω σὺν δαίμονι, hell spoiled, to wit, of those souls which before it kept in hold. Otherwise in the same Oration in Passionem & crucem, he acknowledgeth the Triumph on the Cross, Ἐδὲν γὰρ τὸν νικῶν τὸν δαιμονίου (not δαιμονίου) καὶ τὸν δαίμονα, μὴ ἄλλω (νικῶν) ἀλλ' ἑαυτοῦ βασιλεὺς τὸ πρῶτον. Thus Leo the Emperour, Χριστὸς ἀνέβη καὶ ἄδω αἰχμαλώτους, καὶ τοὺς αἰχμαλώτους ἐκ δαίμονος κινήσας, Hom. de Resur. And thus Macarius supposeth Chrift victoriously speaking unto hell and death, Κάλω σοι ἄδω καὶ Χάτος καὶ θάνατε, ἔκδω, τὰς ἐν γαλαρι- σιδῶναι. Author libelli de Paschate, under the name of S. Ambrose, Expers peccati Chriftus cum ad Tartari ima descenderet, seras inferni januasque confringens, victas peccato animas, mortis dominatione destructa, & diaboli faucibus revocavit ad vitam. Arque ita divinum triumphum æternis caracteribus est conscriptum, dum dicit, Ubi est, Mors, aculeus tuus? Ubi est, Mors, victoria tua? Cap. 4. And the Commentaries under the same name, Gratia Dei abundavit in descensu Salvatoris, omnibus dans indulgentiam, cum triumpho sublati eis in cælum, ad Rom. 5. 14. Secundum animam descendit ad inferna & spoliavit principes tenebrarum ab animabus electorum, Ebert. Serm. 9. contra Catharos. Thus still the Fathers which speak of spoiling hell, of leading captivity captive, of triumphing over Satan in his own quarters, are to be understood in respect to those souls which they thought were taken out of the custody, possession, or dominion of Satan, whether just or unjust.

ded thither he brought none away which were captive there. This was the very notion which those * Fathers had, that the souls of men were conquered by Satan, and after death actually brought into captivity; and that the Soul of Chrift descending to the place where they were, did actually release them from that bondage, and bring them out of the possession of the Devil by force. Thus did he conquer Satan, spoil Hell, and lead captivity captive, according to their apprehension. But if he had taken no Souls from thence, he had not spoiled Hell, he had not led captivity captive, he had not so triumphed in the Fathers sense. Wherefore, being the Scriptures teach us not that Chrift triumphed in Hell; being the Triumph which the Fathers mention, was either in relation to the damned Souls which Chrift took out of those tormenting flames, as some imagined, or in reference to the spirits of the just, which he took out of those infernal habitations, as others did conceive; being we have already thought fit not to admit either of these two as the effect of Chrift's Descent, it followeth that we cannot acknowledge this, as the proper end of the Article.

Nor can we see how the Prophet David could intend so much, as if when he spake those words in the person of our Saviour, *Thou shalt not leave my Soul in Hell*, he should have intended this, Thou shalt not leave my Soul separated from my body, and conveyed into the regions of the damned spirits, amongst all the principalities and powers of Hell; I say, thou shalt not leave me there, battering all the infernal strength, redeeming the prisoners, leading captivity captive, and victoriously triumphing over Death, and Hell, and Satan. In sum, those words of the Prophet cannot admit any interpretation involving a glorious, triumphant and victorious condition, which is not a subject capable of dereliction. For as the hope which he had of his body, that it should not see corruption, supposed that it was to be put in the grave, which could not of it self free the body from corruption; so the hope that his Soul should not be left in Hell, supposeth it not to be in such a state as was of it self contradictory to dereliction.

And this leads me to that end which I conceive most conformable to the words of the Prophet, and least liable to question or objection. We have already shew'n the substance of the Article to consist in this, that the Soul of Chrift, really separated from his body by death, did truly pass unto the places below where the Souls of men departed were. And I conceive the end for which he did so, was, that he might undergoe the condition of a dead man as well as of a living. He appeared here in the similitude of sinfull flesh, and went into the other world in the similitude of a sinner. His body was laid in a grave, as ordinarily the bodies of dead men are; his

his Soul went to the place where the Souls of men are kept who die for their sins, and so did wholly undergo the law of death : but because there was no sin in him, and he had fully satisfied for the sins of others which he took upon him, therefore as God suffered not his Holy One to see corruption, so he left not his Soul in Hell, and thereby gave sufficient security to all those who belong to *Christ* of never coming under the power of Satan or suffering in the flames prepared for the Devil and his Angels. And thus, and for these purposes, may every Christian say, I believe that *Christ Descended into Hell*.

H E R O S E A G A I N.

WHatsoever variations have appeared in any of the other Articles, this part of *Christ's* Resurrection hath been constantly delivered without the least alteration, either by way of addition or † diminution. The whole matter of it is so necessary and essential to the Christian Faith, that nothing of it could be omitted; and in these few expressions the whole doctrine is so clearly delivered, that nothing needed to be added. At the first view we are presented with three Particulars: First, the Action it self, or the Resurrection of *Christ*, *he rose again*. Secondly, the verity, reality, and propriety of that Resurrection, *he rose from the dead*. Thirdly, the Circumstance of Time, or distance of his Resurrection from his Death, *rose from the dead the third day*.

† For though Eusebius Gallicanus and Venantius Fortunatus leave out the last word à mortuis, and some Copies in Rufinus have it not; yet is it generally expressed in all

the rest which are more ancient than Eusebius or Fortunatus: and therefore that omission is to be imputed rather to negligence either of the Author or the Scribe, than to the usage of the Church in their age. Quod die tertio resurrexit à mortuis Dominus Christus, nulus ambigit Christianus, S. Aug. Serm. in Vigiliis Paschæ.

Psal. 2. 2.

Acts 4. 27.
28.

Psal. 2. 6, 7.

For the illustration of the first Particular, and the justification of our belief in *Christ's* Resurrection, it will be necessary first to shew the promised *Messias* was to rise from the dead; and secondly, that *Jesus* whom we believe to be the true and onely *Messias*, did so rise as it was promised and foretold. As the *Messias* was to be the Son of *David*, so was he particularly typified by him and promised unto him. Great were the oppositions which *David* suffered both by his own people and by the nations round about him; which he expressed of himself, and foretold of the *Messias* in those words, *The Kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together against the Lord and against his anointed, that is, his Christ*. From whence it came to pass, that against the holy child *Jesus*, whom God had anointed, both *Herod* and *Pontius Pilate*, with the Gentiles and the people of *Israel*, were gathered together to do whatsoever the hand and the counsel of God determined before to be done, which was to crucifie and slay the Lord of life. But notwithstanding all this opposition and persecution, it was spoken of *David*, and foretold of the son of *David*, *Yet have I set mine anointed upon my holy hill of Sion. I will declare the decree, the Lord hath said unto me, Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee*. As therefore the persecution in respect of *David* amounted onely to a depression of him, and therefore his exaltation was a setting in the Kingdom; so being the conspiracy against the *Messias* amounted to a real crucifixion and death, therefore the exaltation must include a resurrection. And being he which riseth from the dead, begins as it were to live another life, and the grave to him is in the manner of a womb to bring him forth, therefore when God said of his anointed, *Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee*, he did foretell and promise that he would raise the *Messias* from death to life.

But

Acts 1. 3.
4. 33. Resurrection, with fear and great joy ran to bring his disciples word. The blessed Apostles follow them, to whom also he shewed himself alive after his passion by many infallible proofs; who with great power gave witness of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus, the principal part of whose office consisted in this testimony, as appeareth upon the election of *Matthias* into the place of *Judas*, grounded upon this necessity. Wherefore of these men which have companied with us all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us, must one be ordained to be a witness with us of his resurrection. The rest of the Disciples testified the same, to whom he also appeared, even to five hundred brethren at once. These were the witnesses of his own family, of such as worshipped him, such as believed in him. And because the testimony of an adversary is in such cases thought of greatest validity, we have not onely his disciples but even his enemies to confirm it. Those souldiers that watched at the sepulchre, and pretended to keep his body from the hands of his Apostles; they which felt the earth trembling under them, and saw the countenance of an Angel like lightning and his raiment white as snow; they who upon that sight did shake and became as dead men, while he whom they kept became alive: even some of these came into the city and shewed unto the chief Priests all the things that were done. Thus was the Resurrection of Christ confirmed by the highest humane testimonies, both of his friends and enemies, of his followers and revilers.

John 20. 12. But so great, so necessary, so important a mystery had need of a more firm and higher testimony then that of man: and therefore an Angel from heaven, who was ministerial in it, gave a present and infallible witness to it. He descended down, and came and rolled back the stone from the door, and sate upon it. Nay two Angels in white, sitting the one at the head, the other at the feet where the body of Jesus had lain, said unto the women, *Why seek ye the living among the dead? he is not here, but is risen.* These were the witnesses sent from heaven, this the Angelical testimony of the Resurrection.

1 John 5. 9. And if we receive the witness of men, or Angels, the witness of God is greater, who did sufficiently attest this Resurrection; not onely because there was no other power but that of God which could effect it, but as our Saviour himself said, *the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me;* adding these words to his Apostles, *and ye shall bear witness, because ye have been with me from the beginning.* The Spirit of God sent down upon the Apostles did thereby testify that Christ was risen, because he sent that Spirit from the Father; and the Apostles witnessed together with that Spirit, because they were enlightened, comforted, confirmed, and strengthened in their testimony by the same Spirit. Thus God raised up Jesus, and shewed him openly, not to all the people, but unto witnesses chosen before of God, even to those who did eat and drink with him after he rose from the dead. And thus, as it was foretold of the *Messias*, did our Jesus rise; which was the first part of our enquiry.

For the second, concerning the reality and propriety of Christ's Resurrection, expressed in that term *from the dead*, it will be necessary first to consider what are the essential characters and proprieties of a true resurrection, and secondly, to shew how those proprieties doe belong and are agreeable to the raising of Christ. The proper Notion of the Resurrection consists in this, that it is a substantial change by which that which was before, and was corrupted, is reproduced the same thing again. It is said to be a change, that it may be distinguished from a second or new creation. For if God should annihilate a man or Angel, and make the same man or Angel out of nothing, though it were a restitution of the same thing, yet were it not properly a resurrection, because it is not a change or proper mutation, but a pure and

total

total production. This change is called a substantial change to distinguish it from all accidental alterations: he which awaketh from his sleep, ariseth from his bed, and there is a greater change from sickness to health, but neither of these is a Resurrection. It is called a change of that which was, and hath been corrupted, because things immaterial and incorruptible, cannot be said to rise again: Resurrection implying a reproduction, and that which after it was, never was not, cannot be reproduced. Again, of those things which are material and corruptible, of some the forms continue and subsist after the corruption of the whole, of others not. The forms of inanimate bodies, and all irrational Souls, when they are corrupted, cease to be; and therefore if they should be reproduced out of the same matter, yet were not this a proper Resurrection, because thereby there would not be the same individual which was before, but onely a restitution of the *species* by another individual. But when a rational Soul is separated from its body, which is the corruption of a man, that Soul so separated doth exist, and consequently is capable of conjunction and re-union with the body; and if these two be again united by an essential and vital union, from which life doth necessarily flow, then doth the same man live which lived before; and consequently this re-union is a perfect and proper Resurrection from death to life, because the same individual person, consisting of the same Soul and body, which was dead is now alive again.

Having thus delivered the true nature of a proper Resurrection, we shall easily demonstrate that *Christ* did truly and properly rise from the dead. For first, by a true, though miraculous, generation he was made flesh; and lived in his humane nature a true and proper life; producing vital actions as we doe. Secondly, he suffered a true and proper dissolution at his death; his Soul being really separated, and his body left without the least vitality; as our dead bodies are. Thirdly, the same Soul was re-united to the same body, and so he lived again the same man. For the truth of which, two things are necessary to be shewn upon his appearing after death, the one concerning the verity, the other concerning the identity of his body. All the Apostles doubted of the first, for when *Christ* stood in the midst of them, *they were affrighted and supposed that they had seen a spirit*. But he sufficiently assured them of the verity of his corporeity, saying, † *Handle me and see: for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have*. He convinced them all of the identity of his body, saying, *Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself*; especially unbelieving *Thomas*, *Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands, and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into my side, and be not faithless, but believing*. The body then in which he rose, must be the same in which he lived before, because it was the same with which he died.

Luke 24. 37, 39.

† Thus Ignatius disputes against the *Δοκίμασι* in his days, *Εγὼ δὲ οὐκ ἔτιω ἀνέστην ἐν ὧν αὐτὸν οὐδε ἓς πνεύματι ὄντα.*

Kai ὅτε οὐδε

πὸ τοῦ Πάτρως ἡλθεν, ἔρη αὐτοῖς λέγειτε, ἡλιασθησάμενος, καὶ ἵδμεν ὅτι ἐκ ἐμῆ σαρκὸς ἀνέστη. Καὶ αὐτοὶ αὐτὸς ἠδυνάτο καὶ ὁπίσθους κρατῆσθαι τῆς ὧν αὐτὸς καὶ τοῦ πνεύματος. ... Μὴ δὲ ὅτι ἀνέστην ὡς ἄλλοι αὐτοῖς καὶ ὡς ἄλλοι οὐρανὸς, καὶ οὐ πνεύματος ἡνωμένον τῷ Πατρὶ. Epist. ad Smyrn. Palpandam carnem Dominus præbuit, quam januis clausis introduxit, ut esse post resurrectionem ostenderet corpus suum & ejusdem. naturæ & alterius gloriæ, Greg. Hom. 26. in Evang. Resurrexit Christus, absoluta res est. Corpus erat, caro erat, pendit in cruce, positus est in sepulchro, exhibuit illam vivam qui vivebat in illa, Sermon. 153. De Tempore.

And that we might be assured of the Soul as well as of the body, first he gave an argument of the vegetative and nutritive faculty, saying unto them, *Have ye here any meat? and they gave him a piece of a broyled fish, and of an honey comb, and he took it and did eat before them*: secondly, of the sensitive part, conversing with them, shewing himself, seeing and hearing them: thirdly, he gave evidence of his rational and intellectual Soul, by speaking to them and discoursing out of the Scriptures, concerning those things which he spake unto them

them while he was yet with them. Thus did he shew, that the body which they saw was truly and vitally informed with an humane Soul. And that they might be yet further * assured that it was the same Soul by which that body lived before, he gave a full testimony of his divinity by the miracle which he wrought in the multitude of fishes caught, by breathing on the Apostles the Holy Ghost, and by ascending into heaven in the sight of his Disciples. For being *no man ascended into heaven but he which came down from heaven, the Son of man which was in heaven*, being the divinity was never so united to any humane Soul but onely in that person, it appeared to be the same Soul with which he lived and wrought all the miracles before. To conclude, being *Christ* appeared after his death with the same body in which he died, and with the same Soul united to it, it followeth that *he rose from the dead* by a true and proper Resurrection.

Moreover, that the verity and propriety of *Christ's* Resurrection may further appear, it will be necessary to consider the cause thereof, by what power and by whom it was effected. And if we look upon the meritorious cause, we shall find it to be *Christ* himself. For he by his voluntary sufferings in his life, and exact obedience at his death, did truly † deserve to be raised unto life again. Because he drunk of the brook in the way, because he humbled himself unto death, even to the death of the Cross, therefore was it necessary that he should be exalted, and the first degree of his exaltation was his Resurrection. Now being *Christ* humbled himself to the sufferings both of Soul and body; being whatsoever suffered, the same by the virtue and merit of his passion was to be exalted; being all other degrees of exaltation supposed that of the Resurrection; it followeth from the meritorious cause that *Christ* did truly rise from the dead with the same Soul and the same body, with which he lived united, and died separated.

* Ideo clausis ad discipulos ostius introibat, & statim suo dabat Spiritum Sanctum, & dato intelligentiæ lumine sanctarum Scripturarum occulta pandebat; & rursus idem vulnus lateris, fixuras clavorum, & omnia recentissimæ passionis signa monstrabat, ut agnosceretur in eo proprietas diviniæ humanæque naturæ individua permanere, Leo Scrm. 1. de Resurrectione.

† Ut mediator dei & hominum homo Christus Jesus resurrectione clarificaretur, prius humiliatus est passione: non enim à mortuis resurrexisset si mortuus non fuisset. Humilitas claritatis est meritum, claritas humilitatis est præmium, S. Aug. Tract. 104. in Job.

Humilitas claritatis est meritum, claritas humilitatis est præmium, S. Aug. Tract. 104. in Job.

The Efficient cause of the Resurrection of *Christ* is to be considered either as Principal or Instrumental. The Principal cause was God himself; for no other power but that which is omnipotent can raise the dead. It is an act beyond the activity of any creature, and unproportionate to the power of any finite Agent. *This Jesus hath God raised up*, saith the Apostle, *whereof we all are witnesses*. And generally in the Scriptures as our, so *Christ's*, Resurrection is attributed unto God; and as we cannot hope after death to rise to life again without the activity of an infinite and irresistible power, no more did *Christ* himself, who was no otherwise raised then by an eminent act of God's omnipotency; which is excellently set forth by the Apostle, in so high an exaggeration of expressions, as I think is scarce to be parallell'd in any Author, * *That we may know what is the exceeding greatness of his power to us-ward who believe, according to the working of the might of his power which he wrought in Christ when he raised him up from the dead*. Being then Omnipotency is a divine attribute, and infinite power belongs to God alone: being no less power then infinite could raise our Saviour from the dead; it followeth, that whatsoever instrumental action might concur, God must be acknowledged the principal Agent.

* Eph. 1. 19. Καὶ τὸ ἰσχυρὸν τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὸ ἐκτελέσαι τὸν ἵπνον αὐτοῦ, ὡς ἐν ἡμῖν ἐργάσθη, ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ ἡμεῖς ἐκ νεκρῶν ζῶμεν.

which words our Translation comes far short of, and I doubt our Language can scarce reach it. For first, here are *δυνάμεις* and *ἵπνος*, two words to express the power of God and the validity and force of it, but not sufficient; wherefore there is an addition to each of them, *ἡ ἐκτελέσει* & *δυνάμεις*, and *ἐκτελέσει* & *ἵπνος*, two words more to express the eminent greatness of this power and force, but not sufficient yet; and therefore there is another addition to each addition, *ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ ἡμεῖς ἐκ νεκρῶν ζῶμεν*, and *ἡ ἐκτελέσει* & *ἵπνος*, to set forth the eminence and activity of that greatness; and all yet as it were but flat and dull, till it be quickened with an active verb, *ὡς ἐν ἡμῖν ἐργάσθη*, all which he set on work, all which he actuated in Christ, when he raised him from the dead.

And

And therefore in the Scriptures the Raising of *Christ* is attributed to God the Father (according to those words of the Apostle, *Paul an Apostle not of men, neither by men, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father, who raised him from the dead*) but is not attributed to the Father alone. For to whomsoever that infinite power doth belong, by which *Christ* was raised, that person must be acknowledged to have raised him. And because we have already proved that the eternal Son of God is of the same essence, and consequently of the same power with the Father, and shall hereafter shew the same true also of the Holy Ghost, therefore we must likewise acknowledge that the † Father, Son, and Holy Ghost raised *Christ* from the dead. Nor is this onely true by virtue of this ratiocination, but it is also delivered expressly of the Son, and that by himself. It is a weak fallacy used by the Socinians, who maintain that God the Father onely raised *Christ*, and then say, they teach as much as the Apostles did, who attribute it always either generally unto God, or particularly to the Father. For if the Apostles taught it onely so, yet if he which taught the Apostles taught us something more, we must make that also part of our belief. They believe the Father raised *Christ*, because *S. Paul* hath taught them so, and we believe the same; they will not believe that *Christ* did raise himself, but we must also believe that, because he hath said so. These were his words unto the *Jews*, *Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up*, and this is the explication of the Apostle, *But he spake of the temple of his body*, which he might very properly call a temple, because *the fulness of the God-head dwelt in him bodily*. And when he was risen from the dead, his disciples remembered that he had said this unto them, and they believed the Scripture and the word that *Jesus* had said. Now if upon the Resurrection of *Christ* the Apostles believed those words of *Christ*, *Destroy this temple, and I will raise it up*, then did they believe that *Christ* raised himself; for in those words there is a person mentioned which raised *Christ*, and no other person mentioned but himself,

† Quis nisi solus Filius resurrexit, quia solus mori potuit qui carnem habuit? & tamen ab hoc opere quo solus Filius resurrexit non erat Pater alienus; de quo scriptum est, Qui suscitavit a mortuis Jesum. An forte se ipse non suscitavit? Et ubi est quod ait, Solvite templum hoc, & triiduo suscitabo illud? & quod potestatem habere se dicit poseudi &

iterum sumendi animam suam? Quis autem ita desipiat, ut Spiritum Sanctum resurrectionem hominis Christi dicat non cooperatum, cum ipsum hominem Christum fuerit operatus, *S. August. contra Sermones Arianos, cap. 15.*

* *Coloss. 2. 9.*

* *John 2. 19, 21.*

A strange opposition they make to the evidence of this Argument, † saying that God the Father raised *Christ* to life, and *Christ* being raised to life did lift and raise his body out of the grave, as the man sick of the Palsie raised himself from the bed, or as we shall raise our selves out of the graves when the trumpet should sound: and this was all which *Christ* could doe. But if this were true, and nothing else were to be understood in those words of our Saviour, he might as well have said, *Destroy this temple, and in three days any one of you may raise it up*. For when life was restored unto it by God, any one of them might have lifted it up, and raised it out of the grave, and have shewn it alive.

This answer therefore is a meer shift: for to raise a body which is dead, is in the language of the Scriptures to give life unto it, or to quicken a mortal body. * *For as the Father raiseth up the dead and quickeneth them, even so the Son quickeneth whom he will*. He then which quickeneth the dead bodies of others when he raiseth them, he also quickened his own body when he raised that. The temple is supposed here to be dissolved, and being so to be raised again; therefore the suscitation must answer to the dissolution. But the temple of *Christ's* body was dissolved when his Soul was separated, nor was it any

† Aliter Deus Christum suscitavit, aliter Christus corpus suum: Deus Christo vitam restituendo, Christus vita recuperata corpus suum levando, & à sepulchro prodeundo, seque post mortem vivum sistendo præbendoque. Sic & Paralyticus ille crexerat corpus suum, accepta à Christo sanitate:

sic & omnes mortui surgent, & ex monumentis prodibunt, recepta ab eodem Christo vita, *Confessionis Sociniane Vindictæ.*

* *John 2. 19.*

* *John 5. 21.*

* *Ἐγώ τε καὶ ὁ πατήρ ἡμεῖς καὶ ὁ υἱός ἐστιν τὸ αὐτὸ ἔργον; & therefore one in the apostolical answer is to both in the protasis, and sheweth that Christ raised and quickeneth whom he will, which demonstrates his infinite and*

in the same Soul, and the same body. For if we look upon the Father, it is beyond all controversie that he raised his own Son: and as while he was here alive, God spake from heaven saying, *This is my well beloved Son*; so after his death it was the same person, of whom he spake by the Prophet, *Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee*. If we look upon *Christ* himself, and consider him with power to raise himself, there can be no greater assurance that he did totally and truly rise in Soul and body by that Divinity which was never separated either from the body or from the Soul. And thus we have sufficiently proved our second particular, the verity, reality, and propriety of *Christ's* Resurrection; contained in those words, *He rose from the dead*.

The third Particular concerns the time of *Christ's* Resurrection, which is expressed by *the third day*; and those words afford a double consideration: one in respect of the distance of time, as it was after three days; the other in respect of the day, which was the third day from his Passion, and the precise day upon which he arose. For the first of these, we shall shew that the *Messias*, who was foretold both to die and to rise again, was not to rise before, and was to rise upon, the third day after his death; and that, in correspondence to these predictions, our *Jesus*, whom we believe to be the true *Messias*, did not rise from the dead untill, and did rise from the dead upon, the third day.

The typical predictions of this truth were two, answering to our two considerations, one in reference to the distance, the other in respect of the day it self. The first is that of the Prophet *Jonas*, who *was in the belly of the great fish three days and three nights*, and then by the special command of God he was rendred safe upon the drie land, and sent a Preacher of repentance to the great City of *Nineve*. This was an expresse type of the *Messias* then to come, who was to preach repentance and remission of sins to all nations; that *as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whales belly, so should the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth*: and as he was restored alive unto the dry land again, so should the *Messias* after three days be taken out of the jaws of death, and restored unto the land of the living. Jon. 1. 17. and 2. 10.

The type in respect of the day was the waved sheaf in the feast of the first-fruits, concerning which this was the law of God by *Moses*, *When ye come into the land which I give unto you, and shall reap the harvest thereof, then ye shall bring a sheaf of the first-fruits of your harvest unto the Priest, and he shall wave the sheaf before the Lord to be accepted for you, on the morrow after the sabbath the Priest shall wave it, and ye shall offer that day when ye wave the sheaf an he-lamb without blemish of the first year for a burnt offering unto the Lord*. For under the Leviticall law all the fruits of the earth in the land of *Canaan* were prophane; none might eat of them till they were consecrated, and that they were in the feast of the first-fruits. One sheaf was taken out of the field and brought to the Priest, who lifted it up as it were in the name of all the rest, waving it before the Lord, and it was accepted for them, so that all the sheafs in the field were holy by the acceptation of that. *For if the first-fruits be holy, the lump is also holy*. And this was always done the day after the sabbath, that is, the Paschal solemnity, after which the fulness of the harvest followed: by which thus much was foretold and represented, that as the sheaf was lifted up and waved, and the lamb was offered on that day by the Priest to God, so the promised *Messias*, that immaculate lamb which was to die, that Priest which dying was to offer up himself to God, was upon this day to be lifted up and raised from the dead, or rather to shake and lift up and present himself to God, and so to be accepted for us all, that so our dust might be sanctified, our corruption hallowed, our mortality consecrated to eternity. Lev. 23. 10. Rom. 11. 16.

Thus was the Resurrection of the *Messias* after death typically represented both in the distance and the day.

And now in reference to both resemblances, we shall clearly shew that our *Jesus*, whom we believe, and have already proved to be the true *Messias*, was to long and no longer dead, as to rise *the third day*; and did so order the time of his death, that the third day on which he rose might be that very day on which the sheaf was waved, the day after that Sabbath mentioned in the Law.

As for the distance between the Resurrection and the death of *Christ*, it is to be considered first generally in it self, as it is some space of time; secondly, as it is that certain and determinate space of three days. *Christ* did not, would not, suddenly rise, lest any should doubt that he ever died. It was as necessary for us that he should die, as that he should live, and we, which are to believe them both, were to be assured as well of the one as of the other. That therefore we may be ascertained of his death, he did sometime continue it. †He might have descended from the Cross before he died, but he would not, because he had undertaken to die for us. * He might have revived himself upon the Cross, after he had given up the ghost, and before *Joseph* came to take him down, but he would not, lest as *Pilate* questioned whether he were already dead, so we might doubt whether he ever died. The reward of his Resurrection was immediately due upon his passion, but he deferred the receiving of it, lest either of them being questioned, they both might lose their efficacy and intended operation. It was therefore necessary that some space should intercede between them.

† De cruce
descendere
poterat, sed
differebat ut
de sepulchro
resurgeret,
S. Augustine
in Joh. Tract.

22. * Ἡδυνάτω
 μὲ καὶ παρ
 αὐτῶν τῶν θείων
 νάτων τὸ σῶ-
 μα διεγερθεῖται
 καὶ πάλιν διεξ-
 λθοῦν αὐτῶν τῶν
 θεῶν καὶ τῶν ἀν-
 ῶν λόγων, καὶ
 ἔνα πνεῦμα ὅ
 Hom. 43. in d

Again, because *Christ's* exaltation was due unto his humiliation, and the first step of that was his Resurrection; because the Apostles after his death were to preach repentance and remission of sins through his blood, who were no way qualified to preach any such doctrine till he rose again; because the Spirit could not be sent till he ascended, and he could not ascend into heaven till he rose from the grave; therefore the space between his Resurrection and Passion could not be long; nor can there be any reason assigned why it should any longer be deferred, when the verity of his death was once sufficiently proved. Left therefore his Disciples should be long held in suspense, or any person after many days should doubt whether he rose with the same body with which he died, or no; that he might shew himself alive while the soldiers were watching at his grave, and while his crucifixion was yet in the mouths of the people, he would not stay † many days before he rose. Some distance then of time there was, but not great, between his crucifixion and his Resurrection.

† "Ενεργε
 ἐν ᾧ δε-
 χθῆναι τὴν
 θάνατον ἐν
 τῷ σώματι
 ὑπὲρ πάντων
 ἡμῶν (ἵνα
 ἡμεῖς ἡμε-
 λήσωμεν τὴν
 θάνατον ἐν
 τῷ σώματι
 ὑπὲρ πάντων
 ἡμῶν)

The particular length of this space is determined in *the third day* : but that expression being capable of some diversity of interpretation, it is not so easily conclu-

concluded how long our Saviour was dead or buried before he revived or rose again. It is written expressly in *S. Matthew*, that *as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whales belly, so should the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth*. From whence it seemeth to follow, that *Christ's* body was for the space of three whole days and three whole nights in the grave, and after that space of time rose from thence. And hence some have conceived, that being our Saviour rose on the morning of the first day of the week, therefore it must necessarily follow that he died and was buried on the fifth day of the week before, that is on Thursday; otherwise it cannot be true that he was in the grave three nights.

But this place, as exprels as it seems to be, must be considered with the rest in which the same truth is delivered; as when our Saviour said, *After three days I will rise again*: and again, *Destroy this temple, and in three days I will build it up*, or, *within three days I will build another made without hands*. But that which is most used, both in our Saviour's prediction before his death, and in the Apostles language after the Resurrection, is, that *† he rose from the dead the third day*. Now according to the language of the Scriptures; if *Christ* were slain and rose the third day, the day in which he died is one, and the day on which he rose is another, and consequently there could be but one day and two nights between the day of his death and of his Resurrection. As in the case of circumcision, the male child eight days old was to be circumcised, in which the day on which the child was born was one, and the day on which he was circumcised was another, and so there were but six complete days between the day of his birth and the day of his circumcision. The day of Pentecost was the fiftieth day from the day of the wave-offering; but in the number of the fifty days was both the day of the wave-offering and of Pentecost included; as now among the Christians still it is. Whit Sunday is now the day of Pentecost, and Easterday the day of the Resurrection, answering to that of the wave-offering; but both these must be reckoned to make the number of fifty days. *Christ* then who rose upon the first day of the week (as is confessed by all) died upon the sixth day of the week before: or if he had died upon the fifth he had risen not upon the third but the fourth day as *∴ Lazarus* did. Being then it is most certain that our Saviour rose on the third day, being according to the constant language of the *Greeks* and *Hebrews*; he cannot be said to rise to life on the third day, who died upon any other day between which and the day of his Resurrection there intervened any more then one day: therefore those other forms of speech which are farr less frequent, must be so interpreted as to be reduced to this expression of the *third day* so often reiterated.

Matt. 12. 40.

Matt. 27. 63.

Mark 8. 32.

John 2. 19.

Mark 14. 58.

Matt. 16. 21.

17. 23.

20. 19.

Mark 9. 31.

10. 34.

Luke 9. 22.

18. 33.

24. 7. 46.

Acts 10. 40.

1 Cor. 15. 4.

† These several

phrases

are used first

that Christ

was in the

heart of the

earth τῆς γῆς

καὶ τῆς γῆς

secondly, that

he was to rise

καὶ τῆς ἡμέρας

thirdly,

that he would

rebuild this

temple τὸ ἱε-

ρόν ἡμεῶν,

and δὲ τῆς

ἡμέρας

and lastly,

that he rose

τῇ τρίτῃ ἡ-

μέρᾳ, which

is the most ge-

neral and con-

stant form of speech.

∴ Lazarus is said to be τετράτη, four days dead, that is, counting the day on which he died, and the day on which his sister spake so to our Saviour at his sepulchre. And being he was raised then, he rose τῇ τετάρτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, the fourth day. Our Saviour rose τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, and therefore he was τετράτη when he rose; and so the Fathers call him, as you may observe in the words last cited out of *Athanasius*. As we read in *Plutarch*, Σολὼς ὁ Θιαυρίτης: ἡμέρας, καὶ τετράτη ἡμέρᾳ τὰς παρὰ αὐτὰς ἀνέβηκε, De his qui ferro pun. And of that Spirit in a Boy possessed, who hated all women ἐπὶ ἡμέρᾳ καὶ τετράτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἔσειε, *Philostrophus* l. 3. c. 12. What this τετράτη is, the *Greek* Grammarians will teach us. Περὶ μὲν τὸ πῶς ἀπὸ τῆς τοῦ σώματος αἰῶς ἡ τὸ πῶς τῆς ψυχῆς ἡ τετράτης ἡμέρας ἐπὶ τῆς ψυχῆς ἡ τετράτης ἡμέρας, ὅς αἰῶς τὸ, πῶς αἰῶς ἡμέρας; ἀπαιτῶν τὸ, τετράτη τῇ ψυχῇ ἡ τετράτης ἡμέρας, ὅς αἰῶς ἡ πῶς αἰῶς ἡ τετράτης ἡμέρας. *Schol. Eurip. Hecuba*. Τετράτη then, in respect of his coming to or from any place, is that person which is now the third day in or from that place; which cannot be better interpreted, as to the *Greek* language, then in the expression of a *Tertian* Fever, called so because the second accession is upon the third day from the first, and the third from the second, &c. in which case there is but one day between, in which the patient is wholly free from his disease: from whence τῇ μίᾳ, and τετράτῃ is the same in the language of the Physicians. This is excellently expressed by *Alexander Aphrodisiensis* in that problematical Question; Διὰ τὴν μὲν τετράτην ἐν δριμύτι χυμῷ γινώσκοντες, καὶ ἔχοντες μαστίχου καὶ ὑπερδαίνουσαν χολῶν, τῇ μίᾳ καὶ τῇ τετράτῃ αἰσθάνονται τὸ πάλιν τῇ τρίτῃ καὶ τετράτῃ ἡμέρᾳ τὴν ἀσθένειαν καὶ ἡμέραν. the *Tertian* τῇ μίᾳ (sub. ἡμέρᾳ) after one day of perfect intermission; the *Quartan* διὰ δύο ἡμερῶν μίαν. In the same manner he mentions the *quintan*, the *sextan*, and *septan*: in all which this is constantly observable, that the days of perfect intermission are fewer by two, than the number in the name of the fever: for if the Fever

commanded thee to keep the Sabbath day. Now this could not be any special reason why the Jews should observe a seventh day; first, because in reference to their redemption, the number of seven had no more relation then any other number; secondly, because the reason of a seventh day was before rendered in the body of the commandment it self. There was therefore a double reason rendered by God why the Jews should keep that Sabbath which they did; one Special, as to a seventh day, to shew they worshipped that God who was the Creator of the world; the other Individual, as to that seventh day, to signify their deliverance from the Egyptian bondage, from which that seventh day was dated.

Being then upon the Resurrection of our Saviour a greater deliverance and far more plenteous redemption was wrought then that of *Egypt*, and therefore a greater observance was due unto it then to that, the individual determination of the day did pass upon a stronger reason to another day, always to be repeated by a seventhly return upon the reference to the Creation. As there was a change in the year at the coming out of *Egypt*, by the command of God; *This month, the month of Abib, shall be unto you the beginning of months, it shall be the first month of the year to you:* so at this time of a more eminent deliverance a change was wrought in the Hebdomadall or weekly account, and the first day is made the seventh, or the seventh after that first is sanctified. The first day, because on that *Christ* rose from the dead, and the seventh day from that first for ever, because he who rose upon that day was the same God who created the world, and rested on the seventh day; *For by him all things were created that are in heaven and that are in the earth, all things were created by him and for him.*

This day did the Apostles from the beginning most religiously observe, by their meeting together for holy purposes and to perform religious duties. The first observation was performed providentially, rather by the design of God then any such inclination or intention of their own: For the same day saith the Evangelist, that is the day on which *Christ* rose from the dead, at evening, being the first day of the week, the Disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews. The second observation was performed voluntarily, for after eight days again his Disciples were within, and Thomas with them: the first day of the week, when *Christ* rose by the providence of God, the Disciples were together, but Thomas was absent; upon the first day of the next week, they were all met together again in expectation of our Saviour, and Thomas with them. Again, when the day of Pentecost was fully come, which was also the first day of the week they were all with one accord in one place, and having received the promise of the holy Ghost they spake with tongues, preached the Gospel, and the same day were added unto them about three thousand souls. The same practice of convening we find continued in the following years. For upon the first day of the week, when the Disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them: and the same Apostle gave express command concerning the collection for the Saints both to the Churches of Galatia and of Corinth, Upon the first day of the week, let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him.

From this Resurrection of our Saviour, and the constant practice of the Apostles, this first day of the week came to have the name of the *Lords day*, and is so called by S. John, who says of himself in the Revelation, *I was in the Spirit on the Lords day.* And thus the observation of that day, which the Jews did sanctifie, ceased, and was buried with our Saviour, and in the stead of it, the religious observation of that day on which the son of God rose from the dead, by the constant practice of the blessed Apostles was transmitted to the Church of God and so continued in all Ages.

κοινῇ πνεύματι τῷ κυνέδωτον ποιεῖν, ἐπειδὴ παρὰ τὸν ἡμέραν τοῦ ὁ Θεὸς τὸ σκεῖν καὶ τῷ ἑαυτοῦ πνεύματι; χάρις καὶ εὐλογία ὑμῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου καὶ πατρὸς τοῦ θεοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ κυρίου καὶ πατρὸς τοῦ θεοῦ

M m

Jesus Christ of the seed of David was raised from the dead. First, because without it our Faith is vain, and by virtue of it, strong. By this we are assured that he which died was the Lord of life, and though he were crucified through weakness, yet he liveth by the power of God. By this Resurrection from the dead, he was declared to be the Son of God, and upon the morning of the third day did those words of the Father manifest a most important truth, *Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee.* In his death he assured us of his humanity, by his Resurrection he demonstrated his divinity.

Secondly, by the Resurrection we are assured of the justification of our persons, and if we believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead, it will be imputed to us for righteousness: For he was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification. By his death we know that he suffered for sin, by his resurrection we are assured that the * sins for which he suffered were not his own: had no man been a sinner he had not died; had he been a sinner he had not risen again: but dying for those sins which we committed, he rose from the dead to shew that he had made full satisfaction for them, that we believing in him might obtain remission of our sins and justification of our persons. ^a God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, for sin condemned sin in the flesh, and raising up our surety from the prison of the grave, did actually absolve, and apparently acquit him from the whole obligation, to which he had bound himself, and in discharging him acknowledged full satisfaction made for us. ^b Who then shall lay any thing to the charge of Gods elect? It is God that justifieth, who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea rather that is risen again.

ἀναστάσις· εἰ γὰρ ὡς ἀμάρταντες, πῶς ὀνείσει· εἰ δ' ὀνείσει, εὐθὺς ἵλλον ὅτι ἀμάρταντες ἦν ὡς· εἰ δ' ἀμάρταντες ἦν ὡς, πῶς ἵσταται· ὅτι· ἑτέρος· εἰ δ' ἵδ' ἑτέρος, πάντως ἀνέστη. ^a Rom. 8. 3. ^b Rom. 8. 33, 34.

Thirdly, it was necessary to pronounce the Resurrection of Christ as an Article of our Faith, that thereby we might ground, confirm, strengthen and declare our hope. For the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ according to his abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, unto an inheritance uncorruptible and undefiled. By the Resurrection of Christ his Father hath been said to have begotten him; and therefore by the same he hath begotten us, who are called brethren and coheirs with Christ. For if when we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more being reconciled we shall be saved by his life. He laid down his life, but it was for us; and being to take up his own, he took up ours. We are the members of that body of which Christ is the head; if the Head be risen, the members cannot be far behind. He is the first-born from the dead, and we the sons of the Resurrection. The Spirit of Christ abiding in us maketh us the members of Christ, and by the same spirit we have a full right and title to rise with our Head. For if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in us, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken our mortal bodies by his spirit that dwelleth in us. Thus the Resurrection of Christ is the cause of our resurrection by a double causality, as an Efficient, and as an Exemplary cause. As an Efficient cause, in regard our Saviour by and upon his Resurrection hath obtained power and right to raise all the dead; For as in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive. As an Exemplary cause, in regard that all the Saints of God shall rise after the similitude and in conformity to the Resurrection of Christ; For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection. He shall change our vile bodies that they may be like unto his glorious body: That as we have born the image of the earthy, we may also bear

Mic. 2:13

the image of the heavenly. This is the great hope of a Christian, that *Christ* rising from the dead hath obtained the power, and is become the pattern, of his resurrection. *The breaker is come up before them: they have broken up and have passed through the gate, their King shall pass before them, and the Lord on the head of them.*

Ephes. 2:5.
Rom. 6:4.

Luk. 24:5

Mat. 9:6:

Ephes. 3:14.

Rev. 20:6.

Fourthly, it is necessary to profess our Faith in *Christ* risen from the dead, that his Resurrection may effectually work its proper operation on our lives. For as it is efficient and exemplary to our bodies, so it is also to our souls. *When we were dead in sins, God quickned us together with Christ.* And, *as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we should walk in newness of life.* To continue among the graves of sin while *Christ* is risen, is to incur that reprehension of the Angel, *why seek ye the living among the dead?* To walk in any habitual sin, is either to deny that sin is death, or *Christ* is risen from the dead. Let then *the dead bury the dead*, but let not any Christian bury him who rose from death that he might live. *Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light.* There must be a spiritual Resurrection of the Soul before there can be a comfortable Resurrection of the body. *Blessed and holy is he that hath part in this first resurrection, on such the second death hath no power.*

Having thus explained the manner of *Christ's* Resurrection, and the necessity of our faith in him risen from the dead, we may easily give such a brief account as any Christian may understand what it is he should intend when he makes profession of this part of the Creed; for he is conceived to acknowledge thus much, I freely and fully assent unto this as a truth of infinite certainty and absolute necessity, that the eternal Son of God, who was crucified and died for our sins, did not long continue in the state of death, but by his infinite power did revive and raise himself by re-uniting the same Soul which was separated to the same body which was buried, and so rose the same man: and this he did the third day from his death; so that dying on Friday the sixth day of the week, the day of the preparation of the Sabbath, and resting in the grave the Sabbath day, on the morning of the first day of the week he returned unto life again, and thereby consecrated the weekly revolution of that first day to a religious observation untill his coming again. And thus I believe *the third day he rose again from the dead.*

Atiq. l. 3. c. 8. Where it is to be observed, that the place which S. Paul calls the first tabernacle, Josephus terms βένηλόν πνα χ' κοινόν τόπον, a common and profane place, as representing this world in which we live, and our life and conversation here: as the Apostle seems to speak, Heb. 9. 1. Εἰς ἃ ἡμεῖς καὶ ἡ κοινή (κοινὴ) διακονοῦμεθα λατρείᾳ τῷ ἁγίῳ κοσμητόν. For ἁγίον κοσμητόν, sanctum secular, or as the Syriack **בֵּית קֹדֶשׁ עֲלֻמָּנָה** domus sancta mundana, may well be that part of the tabernacle which represented this world, and therefore termed common and profane in respect of that more holy part which represented heaven.

The same Ascension was also declared prophetically, as we read in the Prophet David, * *Thou hast ascended up on high, thou hast led captivity captive, thou hast received gifts for men*: which phrase *on high* in the language of David signifying heaven, could be applied properly to no other conquerour but the *Messias*, not to *Moses*, not to *David*, not to *Joshuah*, not to any but the *Christ*; who was to conquer sin, and death, and hell, and triumphing over them to ascend unto the highest heaven, and thence to send the precious and glorious gifts of the Spirit unto the sons of men. The Prophecie of *Micah* did foretell as much, even in the opinion and confession of the * *Jews* themselves, by those words, *The breaker is come up before them: they have broken up and have passed through the gates and are gone out by it; and their Kings shall pass before them, and the Lord at the head of them*. And thus *Christ's* Ascension was declared prophetically as well as typically; which was our first Consideration.

שובה למרום
return on high, that is in the language of the Chaldee Paraphrase, **לְבִי שִׁנְתָּךְ חַיִּי**, return to the house of thy majesty; and Psal. 93. 4. **אֲדִיר בְּמִרוֹם יְהוָה**, the Lord on high is mighty, Chald. **בְּשָׁמַי מְרוֹמָא**, in the upper heavens. Psal. 71. 19. Thy righteousness, O Lord, is **עַד מִרוֹם** usque ad excelsum; the Chaldee, again, **עַד שָׁמַי מְרוֹמָא**, In the same manner in this place, **עָלִיתָ לְמִרוֹם**, thou hast ascended on high, the Chaldee Paraphrase translateth **מִלְּקַתָּא לְרָקִיעַ** thou hast ascended the firmament: and be addeth immediately **מִשְׁרָא נְבִיא** O thou Prophet Moses: yet there is a plain contradiction in that interpretation; for if it were meant of *Moses*, it cannot be the firmament; if it were the firmament it cannot be understood of *Moses*, for he never ascended thither. * This breaker up is by the confession of the *Jews* the title of the *Messias*. So the Author of Sopher Abchath Ruchal in his description of the coming of the *Messias* maketh use of this place. And the same appeareth farther by that saying of *Moses Haddarshan* in Berekhit Rabba, **נִשְׁתַּיֵּה מִלְּמַטָּה וְהָ אַבְרָהָם נִשְׁתַּיֵּה מִלְּמַעְלָה** The plantation from below is Abraham, the plantation from above is *Messias*, as it is written, **עַלֵּה הַפֶּרֶץ לְפָנֵינוּ יְיָ** When shall we rejoyce? when the feet of the Shecinah shall stand upon the Mount of Olives; and again, **אֵמִית אֲנִי שְׂמֹחִים כְּשִׁיעֲמֵרוּ רִגְלֵי הַשְּׂכִינָה עַל הַר הַזֵּה** When shall we rejoyce? when the captives shall ascend from Hell, and Shecinah in the head, as it is written (*Micah*. 2. 13.) **וְהָ מֶלֶךְ יֵשׁוּעָה יֵשׁוּעָה** Their King shall pass before them, and the Lord in the head of them.

Secondly, whatsoever was thus represented and foretold of the promised *Messias*, was truly and really performed by our *Jesus*. That onely begotten and eternal Son of God, who by his divinity was present in the heavens while he was on earth, did by a local translation of his humane nature, really and truly ascend from this earth below on which he lived, into the heavens above, or rather above all the heavens, in the same body, and the Soul, with which he lived and died and rose again.

The Ascent of *Christ* into heaven was not metaphorical or figurative, as if there were no more to be understood by it, but onely that he obtained a more heavenly and glorious state or condition after his Resurrection. For whatsoever alteration was made in the body of *Christ* when he rose, whatsoever glorious qualities it was invested with thereby, that was not his Ascension, as appeareth by those words which he spake to *Mary*, *Touch me not, for I am not yet ascended to my Father*. Although he had said before to *Nicodemus*, *No man ascended up to heaven but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven*; which words imply that he had then ascended: yet even those concern not this Ascension. For that was therefore onely true, because the Son of man, not yet conceived in the Virgin's womb, was not in heaven, and after his conception by virtue of the hypostatical union was in heaven; from whence speaking after the manner of men, he might well say, that he had ascended into heaven; because whatsoever was first on earth and then in heaven, we say ascended into heaven. Wherefore beside that

Joh. 20. 17.

Joh. 3. 13.

that grounded upon the hypostatical union, beside that glorious condition upon his Resurrection, there was yet another and that more proper Ascension: for after he had both those ways ascended, it was still true that he had not yet ascended to his Father.

Now this kind of Ascension, by which *Christ* had not yet ascended when he spake to *Mary* after his Resurrection, was not after to be performed; for at the same time he said unto *Mary*, *Go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father, and your Father.* And when this Ascension was performed, it appeared manifestly to be a true local translation of the Son of man as man from these parts of the world below into the heavens above, by which that body which was before locally present here on earth, and was not so then present in heaven, became substantially present in heaven, and no longer locally present in earth. For *when he had spoken unto the Disciples, and blessed them*, laying his hands upon them, and so was corporally present with them, even *while he blessed them he parted from them, and while they beheld, he was taken up, and a cloud received him out of their sight*, and so he was carried up into heaven, while they looked stedfastly towards heaven as he went up. This was a visible departure, as it is described, a real removing of that body of *Christ* which was before present with the Apostles; and that body living after the Resurrection, by virtue of that soul which was united to it: and therefore the Son of God according to his humanity was really and truly translated from these parts below unto the heavens above, which is a proper local ascension.

Thus was *Christ's* Ascension visibly performed in the presence and sight of the Apostles, for the confirmation of the reality and the certainty thereof.

† They did not see him when he rose, but they saw him when he ascended; because an eye-witness was not necessary unto the act of his Resurrection, but it was necessary unto the act of his Ascension. It was sufficient that *Christ* shewed himself to the Apostles alive after his passion; for being they knew him before to be dead, and now saw him alive, they were thereby assured that he rose again: for whatsoever was a proof of his life after death, was a demonstration of his Resurrection. But being the Apostles were not to see our Saviour in heaven, being the session was not to be visible to them on earth, therefore it was necessary they should be eye-witnesses of the act who were not with the same eyes to behold the effect.

† Βλεπόντων
μὲν οὐκ ἀνέστη,
βλεπόντων δὲ
ἐπὶ τῆς ἀν-
όδου ἐπα-
νέστη. ὁμο-
λογεῖ δὲ ὁ
κύριος ὅτι
τὸ πνεῦμα
τοῦ κυρίου
ἦν ἐν αὐ-
τῷ. καὶ ὁ
κύριος ἦν
ἐν αὐτῷ.
καὶ ὁ κύριος
ἦν ἐν αὐ-
τῷ. καὶ ὁ
κύριος ἦν
ἐν αὐτῷ.

† τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ κυρίου. παρὲν αὐτῷ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ κυρίου ἦν ἐν αὐτῷ, αὐτὸς τὰ ταῦτα φεγγόμενος παρὸν, καὶ τὸ μυστήριον. ἀλλὰ τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ κυρίου ἦν ἐν αὐτῷ. S. Chr. Hom. 2. in Act. Apost.

Beside the eye-witness of the Apostles, there was added the testimony of the Angels; those blessed Spirits which ministred before, and saw the face of God in heaven, and came down from thence, did know that *Christ* ascended up from hence unto that place from whence they came: and * because the eyes of the Apostles could not follow him so far, the inhabitants of that place did come to testify of his reception; For * *behold two men stood by them in white apparel, which also said, Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? This same Jesus which is taken up from you into heaven shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him goe into heaven.* We must therefore acknowledge and confess against all the wild † Heresies of old, that the eternal Son of God who died and rose again, did with the same body and Soul, with which he died and rose, ascend up to heaven; which was the second Particular considerable in this Article.

* Ἐπὶ τῶν οὐ-
ρανῶν οἱ
ἀγγέλων ἦν
ἐν αὐτῷ.
καὶ ὁ κύριος
ἦν ἐν αὐ-
τῷ. καὶ ὁ
κύριος ἦν
ἐν αὐτῷ.
καὶ ὁ κύριος
ἦν ἐν αὐ-
τῷ. καὶ ὁ
κύριος ἦν
ἐν αὐτῷ.

(παρὸν αὐτῷ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ κυρίου ἦν ἐν αὐτῷ) ὅτι ὁ κύριος ἦν ἐν αὐτῷ ἀναλαμβάνον, αὐτὸς λοιπὸν ἐδίδασκεν οἱ ἀγγέλους, S. Chr. Hom. 2. in Act. Apost.

* Act. 1. 10. 11.

† The various Heresies in the Primitive times concerning the humanity of *Christ*

Christ ascended into heaven are briefly touched by Tertullian; *Ut & illi erubescant, qui adfirmant carnem in caelis vacuum sensu ut vaginam exemplo Christo federe*, aut qui carnem & animam tantumdem, aut tantummodo animam, carnem vero non jam, *De carne Christi*, c. 24. Of which Gregory Nazianzenus, *Εἰς τὴν ἀποτίθεσθαι τὴν τῶν σάρκα λέγει, καὶ γυναικὶ τῇ τῶν θεῶν τῶν σαρμάτων*, ἀνὰ αὐτὴν τὴν ἀποτίθεσθαι καὶ τὴν καὶ ἔξωθεν, καὶ ἰδοὺ τῶν δόξαν τῆς παρρησίας, *Epist. 1. ad Cledonium*. The Appellite taught that *Christ left his body dissolved in the air, and so ascended into heaven without it*; Hunc Appellem dicunt quidam etiam de Christo tam falsa sentisse, ut diceret eum non quidem carnem duxisse de caelo, sed ex elementis mundi accepisse, quæ mundo reddidit, cum sine carne resurgens in caelum ascendit, *S. Aug. Hæres. 23*. This opinion of Apelles is thus delivered by Epiphanius in his own words, *Ἐν τῷ ἔργῳ τῷ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐκπαρρησιαν ἡλθεν εἰς τὴν γῆν καὶ συνήγαγον αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ περὶ τῶν σαρμάτων σώματος..... Ἐδωκεν ὁ Χριστὸς αὐτὸν παθεῖν ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ σώματι, καὶ ἐσαυράσθη ἐν αὐτῇ καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτὸν τῶν σαρμάτων τῆς αὐτοῦ μαθητῶν, καὶ ἀναλῦσαι αὐτὸν τῶν ἐκπαρρησιαν αὐτοῦ ἀπαικτεῖς πάλιν ἐκείνῳ τῷ σωματι τὸ ἰδίον σώμα, τὸ θεμελίον τῷ θεῷ, τὸ λυγρὸν τῷ λυγρῷ, τὸ ἐξῆν τῷ ἐξῆν, τὸ ὑπερὸν τῷ ὑπερῷ καὶ ἔπος δόξαι αὐτὸ πάλιν τὸ ἐκπαρρησιαν σώμα ἀνέστη εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, ὅθεν καὶ ἡμεῖς φησὶς, καὶ ὁ δὲ μὴς φύσις, καὶ ἀσπαρτὶς δέξασθαι ἔχῃ ἰσαυτῶν.*

Thirdly, being the name of *heaven* admitteth divers acceptations in the sacred Scriptures, it will be necessary to enquire what is the true Notion of it in this Article, and what was the proper termination of *Christ's* Ascension. In some sense it might be truly said *Christ* was in heaven before the cloud took him out of the Apostles sight; for the clouds themselves are called the clouds of heaven: but that heaven is the first; and our Saviour certainly ascended at least as far as *S. Paul* was caught up, that is, into the third heaven; For *we have a great High-priest that is passed* through the heavens*. And needs must he pass through the heavens, because he was *made higher than the heavens*; For *he that descended is the same also that ascended up far above all heavens*. When therefore *Christ* is said to have ascended into heaven, we must take that word as signifying as much as the heaven of heavens, and so *Christ* is ascended through and above the heavens, and yet is still in heaven; for he is *entred^c into that within the vail*, there is his passage through the heavens: *into the holy place, even into heaven it self to appear in the presence of God*, this is the heaven of heavens. For *thus said the Lord, the heaven is my throne and the earth is my footstool*; and as *Christ* descended unto the footstool of his Father in his humiliation, so he ascended unto the throne of his Father in his exaltation. This was the place of which our Saviour spake to his Disciples, *What and if you shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before?* Had he been there before in body, it had been no such wonder that he should have ascended thither again: but that his body should ascend unto that place where the Majesty of God was most replendent; that the flesh of our flesh, and bone of our bone should be seated far above all Angels and Archangels, all principalities and powers, even at the right hand of God; this was that which *Christ* propounded as worthy of their greatest admiration. Whatsoever heaven then is higher than all the rest which are called heavens; whatsoever sanctuary is holier than all which are called holies, whatsoever place is of greatest dignity in all those courts above, into that place did he ascend, where in the splendor of his Deity he was before he took upon him our humanity.

As therefore when we say *Christ* ascended, we understand a literal and local ascent, not of his Divinity, (which possesseth all places, and therefore being every where is not subject to the imperfection of removing any whither) but of his humanity, which was so in one place that it was not in another: so when we say the place into which he ascended was heaven, and from the expositions of the Apostles must understand thereby the heaven of heavens or the highest heaven, it followeth that we believe the body with the soul of *Christ* to have passed far above all those celestial bodies which we see, and to look upon that opinion as a low conceit which left his body in the † Sun.

† The Seleucian and Hermian taught that

the body of *Christ* ascended no farther then the Sun, in which it was deposited; of whom Philastrius, and out of him *S. Anstasius*, Negant Salvatorem in carne sedere ad dextram Patris, sed ea se exuile perhibent, camque in Sole posuisse, accipientes occasionem de Psalmo, In Sole posuit Tabernaculum suum, *Hæres. 59*. The same opinion Gregory Nazianzenus attributes to the Alogians.

ἐπιπλήρης ἐστὶ τῆ ἀλλοτρίου καὶ τῆ ἰδίας. ὅς τ' ἔδωκεν, καὶ ὅς ἐπικρατεῖται, Rom. 11. in Epist. ad Hebræos. Another notion there is among the Greeks of the fruit which is ripe and come to perfection before the rest, as Isaiah 28. 4. Καὶ ἔσται τὸ ἄνθος τὸ ἐμπρόν τ' ἐλπίος τ' ἰδέσθης ἐπ' αὐτοῦ ἔρας ὡς πεδερμοῦ σύκας, תְּבַבִּי, tanquam primitiæ, or fructus primogeniti, ficus præcox. Hesychius, Πεδερμοῦ, τὰ ἐν τῷ ἄρῳ ξύλα, ἢ τὰ πεδερμοῦ σύκα. lege Πεδερμοῦ, for they indeed are properly τὰ πεδερμοῦ σύκα (Cōca, præcokes ficus : For so Theophrastes speaking particularly ἐπὶ Cυκῆς, has these words, κατὰ τὴν φύσιν τῆς πρῆτης ὑγιότητος, ἔσται αὐτὸ ἐμπρόν) ῥοδάκας καὶ ὕδης καὶ σπέρμης, ἐξ-ακλῆσται πῶς βλάστησιν· ὅπ' ἔστι Cυμπαίον φατέον, ὅπ' ἐν τούτῳ τὸ μέγας ὁ καρπὸς ἀρίστος. ἔδει καὶ οἱ πε-δερμοῖ, De censu Plant. lib. 5. cap. 1. & paulo post, Πάλιν δ' αὖτ' ἐπὶ πεδερμοῦ αἱ ῥοδάκας, ὅς, ἢτε λαχανικὴ καὶ λαχανοφάγος καὶ ἔτερος πλείους, αἱ δ' ἔστιν ὅσων. The first fruits of the early figs were called πεδερμοῖ, and the tree which bare them πεδερμὴ. Now as this early fruit doth fore-run the latter fruit of the same tree, and comes to ripeness and perfection in its kind before the rest; so our Saviour goes before those men of the same nature with him, and they follow in their time to the maturity of the same perfection.

^a Ephes. 2. 6. As therefore ^a God hath quickned us together with Christ, and hath raised us up together by virtue of his resurrection; so hath he also made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus, by virtue of his ascension. We are already seated there [†] in him, and hereafter shall be seated by him; in him already as in our head, which is the ground of our hope; by him hereafter, as by the cause conferring, when hope shall be swallowed up into fruition.

Thirdly, the profession of Faith in Christ ascended, is necessary for the exaltation of our affections. ^b For where our treasure is, there will our hearts be also. ^c If I be lifted up from the earth, I will draw all men unto me, saith our Saviour; and if those words were true of his crucifixion, how powerfull ought they to be in reference to his ascension? ^d When the Lord would take up Elijah into heaven, Elisha said unto him, As the Lord liveth, and as thy soul liveth, I will not leave thee; when Christ is ascended up on high, we must follow him with the wings of our meditations and with the chariots of our affections. ^e If we be risen with Christ, we must seek those things which

^f are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God. If we be dead, and our life hid in Christ with God, we must set our affection on things above, not on things on earth. Christ is ascended into heaven to teach us, that we are strangers and pilgrims here as all our fathers were, and that another coun-
^g trey belongs unto us: from whence we ^f as strangers and pilgrims should learn to abstain from fleshly lusts, and not mind earthly things; as knowing that we are ^h Citizens of heaven, from whence we look for our Saviour, the Lord Jesus, yea ^h fellow-citizens with the Saints, and of the household of God. We should trample upon our sins, and subdue the lusts of the flesh, that our conver-
ⁱ sation may be correspondent to our Saviours condition; that where the eyes of the Apostles were forced to leave him, thither our thoughts may follow him.

Fourthly, the Ascension of Christ is a necessary Article of the Creed in respect of those great effects which immediately were to follow it, and did absolutely depend upon it. The blessed Apostles had never preached the Gospel, had they not been indued with power from above; but none of that power had they received, if the Holy Ghost in a miraculous manner had not descended: And the Holy Ghost had not come down, except our Saviour had ascended first. For he himself when he was to depart from his Disci-
^j ples grounded the necessity of his departure upon the certainty of this truth, saying, If I go not away the Comforter will not come unto you, but if I depart I will send him unto you. Now if all the infallibility of those truths, which we as Christians believe, depend upon the certain information which the Apostles had, and those Apostles appear to be no way infallible till the cloven tongues had lit upon them, it was first absolutely necessary that the Holy Ghost should so descend. Again, being it was impossible that the Spi-
^k rit of God in that manner should come down, untill the Son of God had as-
^l cended into heaven; being it was not fit that the second Advocate should officiate on earth, till the first Advocate had entered upon his of-
^m fice in heaven; therefore in respect of this great work the Son of God must necessarily

John 16. 7.

[†] Τῆς κατὰ-
λῆς καὶ ἐξ-
ουαν καὶ τὸ
σῶμα (καὶ
καὶ τὸ σῶμα)
τὸ ἐπὶ τῆς
γῆς, ἐν Χρι-
στῷ Ἰησοῦ.
S. Chrysost.
in locum.

^b Matt. 6. 21.

^c Job. 12. 32.

^d 2 King. 2. 2.

^e Coloss. 3. 1.
^{2. 3.}

^f 1 Pet. 2. 11.

^g Phil. 3. 19.

^h 20.

ⁱ Ephes. 2. 19.

John 16. 7.

necessarily ascend, and in reference to that necessity we may well be obliged to confess that Ascension.

Upon these considerations we may easily conclude what every Christian is obliged to confess in those words of our Creed, *He ascended into heaven*: for thereby he is understood to express thus much, I am fully persuaded, that the onely begotten and eternal Son of God, after he rose from the dead, did with the same Soul and body with which he rose, by a true and local translation convey himself from the earth on which he lived, through all the regions of the air, through all the celestial Orbs, untill he came unto the heaven of heavens, the most glorious presence of the Majesty of God. And thus I believe in *Jesus Christ* who *ascended into heaven*.

And sitteth on the Right hand of God the Father Almighty.

THE second part of the Article containeth two Particulars; the Session of the Son, and the Description of the Father: the first sheweth that *Christ* upon his ascension is set down *at the right hand of God*: the second assureth us that the God, at whose right hand *Christ* is set down, is the *Father Almighty*.

For the explication of *Christ's* Session, three things will be necessary; First, to prove that the promised *Messias* was to sit at the right hand of God; Secondly, to shew that our *Jesus*, whom we believe to be the true *Messias*, is set down at the right hand of God; Thirdly, to find what is the importance of that phrase, and in what propriety of expression it belongs to *Christ*.

That the promised *Messias* was to sit at the right hand of God, was both pretypified and foretold. *Joseph* who was betrayed and sold by his brethren, was an express type of *Christ*, and though in many things he represented the *Messias*, yet in none more then in this, that being taken out of the Prison he was exalted to the Supreme power of *Egypt*. For thus *Pharaoh* spake to *Joseph*, *Thou shalt be over my house, and according to thy word shall all my people be ruled; onely in the throne will I be greater then thou.* And *Pharaoh* took off the ring from his hand, and put it upon *Joseph's* hand, and arrayed him in vestures of fine linnen, and put a gold chain about his neck; And he made him to ride in the second chariot which he had, and they cried before him, *Bow the knee*; and he made him ruler over all the land of *Egypt*. Thus *Joseph* had the execution of all the Regal power committed unto him, all edicts and commands were given out by him, the managing of all affairs was through his hands, onely the Authority by which he moved remained in *Pharaoh* still. This was a clear representation of the Son of man, who by his sitting on the right hand of God, obtained power to rule and govern all things both in heaven, and earth, (especially as the *ruler of his house*, that is, the Church,) with express command that all things, both in heaven, and earth, and under the earth, should bow down before him: but all this in the name of the Father; to whom the throne is still reserved, in whom the original authority still remains. And thus the Session of the *Messias* was pretypified.

Gen. 41. 40, 42, 43.

The same was also expressly foretold not onely in the sense but in the phrase. *The Lord said unto my Lord, saith the Prophet David, Sit thou at my right hand untill I make thine enemies thy foot-stool.* The Jews have endeavoured to avoid this prophetic, but with no success: some make the person to

† This Juste
Martyr testi-
fied of the
Jews in his
age, Kai τὸ
πν̄ τ̄ τ̄
μὴν ὅτι οἱ
† Εὐχίας τ̄
βασιλεὺς ἐξ-
γῆς πολυῶν, ἐκ ἀγνοῶν, ἐπέπιν. Dialog. cum Tryphone.

whom God speaks to be † Ezechias, some * Abraham, some Zorobabel, others † David, others .: the people of Israel; and because the Prophecie cannot belong to him who made the Psalm, therefore they which attribute the prediction to Abraham, tell us the Psalm was penned by his * Steward Eliezer: they which expound it of David, say that one of his Musicians was Authour of it.

And out of him Tertullian, citing this Psalm. Sed necesse est ad meam sententiam pertinere defendam eas Scripturas quas & Judæi nobis avocare conantur. Dicunt denique hunc Psalmum in Ezechiam cecinisse, quia is sederit ad dexteram templi, & hostes ejus averterit Deus & absumpserit. Adv. Marcionem l. 5. c. 9.

* So S. Chrysostom speaking of the Jews, Τίνα ἐν ἐκείνοις τ̄ λιβντά πασι; τ̄ Θείῳ τ̄ τ̄ ἀκούσῃ; τ̄ Ἀβραάμ τ̄ ἐπερὶ τ̄ Ζωε-
δάδελ, ἡ ἀλλοῖ ἐπερὶ, ad locum. Ita Catena Græca, Οἱ τ̄ Ἰουδαίῳ, τὸ γελοῖότερον, οἱ τ̄ Ἀβραάμ εἰσὶν ἀκούσῃ. καὶ οἱ Ζωε-
δάδελ τ̄ Θείῳ. And this Exposition is now followed by Solomon Iarshi and Lipmannus, Iarshi acknowledging it to be ancient,
רבותיו ורשויו באברהם אביו ואנו אפרשנו כדבריהם נאם ה' לאברהם: † This is
the Exposition of the later Rabbins, as of Aven Ezra, and David Kemchi, who attribute the subject of the Psalm to David: And not
only they, but the ancient Rabbins since our Saviour's time, as appeareth by those words of S. Chrysostom, Καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τὴν ἡμῶν
ἐπ' ἐδὲν τ̄ Ζωεδάδελ ἐλαδὸν ἐπερὶ τ̄ Δαβὶδ τ̄ ἐπ' αὐτῷ ἱερῶν τι πῦν. .: Ἀλλὰ ἡ ἐ-
περὶ πᾶσι λιβνσι τῶν ἱουδαίων, ἐπ' αὐτῷ λαῷ λιβνσις τὰ τὰ εἰρηδῶν, & paulo post, Πῶς ἡ τ̄ τ̄ Δαβὶδ, ἡ τ̄ Ζωεδάδελ, ἡ τ̄
λαῷ τὰ τὰ ἀρμῶσιν; S. Chrysostom. To which purpose saith S. Chrysostom, concerning the Jews of his time, Τί γάρ
φασιν ἄλλοι πάλιν; οἱ οὐ πᾶσι τ̄ Ἀβραάμ τὰ τὰ λιβνσι ἐπ' αὐτῷ Κρείττ τ̄ ἰαυτῷ.

But first it is most certain that David was the Pen-man of this Psalm; the title speaks as much, which is, .: A Psalm of David: from whence it followeth that the prediction did not belong to him, because 'twas spoken to his Lord. Nor could it indeed belong to any of the rest which the Jews imagine, because neither Abraham, nor Ezechias, nor † Zorobabel could be the Lord of David, much less the people of Israel (to whom some of the Jews referred it) who were not the Lords, but the subjects of that David. Beside, he which is said to sit at the right hand of God is also said to be a Priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek; but neither Abraham, nor Ezechias, nor any which the Jews have mentioned was ever any * Priest of God. Again, our Saviour urged this Scripture against the Pharisees, saying, What think ye of Christ? whose Son is he? they say unto him, The Son of David. He saith unto them, How then doth David in Spirit call him Lord, saying, The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand till I make thine enemies thy footstool? If David then call him Lord, how is he his Son? And no man was able to answer him a word. From whence 'tis evident that the Jews of old, even the Pharisees, the most accurate and skilfull amongst them, did interpret the Psalm of the Messias; for if they had conceived the prophecie belonged either to Abraham, or David, or any of the rest since mentioned by the Jews, they might very well, and questionless would have answered our Saviour, that this belonged not to the Son of David. It was therefore the general opinion of the Church of the Jews before our Saviour, and of divers † Rabbins since his death, that this prediction did concern the Kingdom of Christ. And thus the Session of the Messias at the right hand of God was not onely represented typically, but foretold prophetically: which is our first Consideration.

† This is the Argument which the Fathers used against the Jews, as Justus Martyr, in opposition to their presence of Ezechias, Ἰερὸς ἡ ἐπ' αὐτῷ ἱερῶν Εὐχίας, ὅτι ἐδὲν αὐτῷ ἱερῶς τ̄ Θείῳ, ἐπ' αὐτῷ ἀντιστοιχῶν παμύστη, Dial. cum Tryphone; and from him Tertullian. Quod & in ipso hic accedit, Tu es Sacerdos in ævum. Nec Sacerdos autem Ezechias, nec in ævum, et si fuisset. Secundum ordinem, inquit, Melchizedek. Quid Ezechias ad Melchizedek Altissimi sacerdotem, & quidem non circumcisi? Adv. Marcionem l. 5. c. 9. and so Chryl. in the words before mentioned. † As in the Mishnah Talm. Psal. 110. 36. נאם מושיב מלך המשיח לימינו שנ' לארני שב לימיני: R. Jodan in the name of Rabbi Chama said that in the time to come God shall place Messias the King at his right hand, as it is written (Psal. 110. 1.) The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand. So Moses Badderjan on Gen. 18, Hereafter God holy and blessed shall sit the King Messias לימינו on his right hand, as it is written. (Psal. 110.) The Lord said, &c.

Secondly, we affirm, that our Jesus, whom we worship as the true Messias, according unto that particular prediction, when he ascended up on high, did sit

fit down at the right hand of God. His Ascension was the way to his Session, and his Session the end of his Ascension; as the Evangelist expresseth it, *He was received up into heaven, and sate on the right hand of God*; or as the Apostle, *God raised Christ from the dead; and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places*. There could be no such Session without an Ascension; and *David is not ascended into the heavens, but he saith himself, The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, untill I make thy foes thy foot-stool*. Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, let all the blind and wilfull Jews be convinced of this truth, that God hath not set at his own right hand neither Abraham nor David, neither Ezechias nor Zerubbabel, but hath made that same Jesus whom they have crucified both Lord and Christ. Mark 16. 19.
Acts 2. 34.
35. 36.

This was an honour never given, never promised to any man but the *Messias*: the glorious Spirits stand about the throne of God, but never any of them set down at the right hand of God. For to which of his Angels said he at any time, *Sit on my right hand, untill I make thine enemies thy foot-stool*. But Christ was so assured of this honour, that before the Council of the Chief Priests and the Elders of the people, when he foresaw his death contrived, and his Cross prepared, even then he expressed the confidence of his expectation, saying, *Hereafter shall the Son of man sit on the right hand of the power of God*. And thus our Jesus, whom we worship as the true promised *Messias*, is gone into heaven, and is on the right hand of God. Which was our second Consideration. Heb. 1. 13.
Luk. 22. 69.
1 Pet. 3. 22.

Our next inquiry is, what may be the utmost importance of that phrase, and how it is applicable unto Christ. The phrase consists of two parts, and both to be taken metaphorically: First therefore, we must consider what is the *right hand of God*, in the language of the Scriptures; Secondly, what is it to sit down at that right hand. God being a Spirit can have no material or corporeal parts; and consequently as he hath no body, so in a proper sense can he have no † hands at all: but because God is pleased to descend to our capacity; and not onely to speak by the mouths of men, but also after the manner of men, he expresseth that which is in him by some analogy with that which belongs to us. The hands of man are those organical parts which are most * active, and executive of our power; by those the strength of our body is expressed, and most of our natural and artificial actions are performed by them. From whence the power of God, and the exertion or execution of that power is signified by the hand of God. Moreover being by a general custom of the world the right hand is more used then the left, and by that general use acquireth a greater firmitude and strength, therefore the *right hand* of God signifieth the exceeding great and infinite power of God.

† Credimus etiam quod sedet ad dextram Dei Patris. Nec ideo tamen quasi humana forma circumscriptum esse Deum Patre arbitrandum est, ut de illo cogitantibus dextrum aut sinistrum latius animo occurrat, S. Aug.

De Fide & Symb.

* Succedunt brachia & validi lacertorum tori, validæ ad operandum manus, & proceribus digitis habiles ad tenendum: Hinc aprior usus operandi, hinc scribendi elegantia, & ille calamus scribæ velociter scribentis, quo divinæ vocis exprimuntur oracula. Manus est quæ cibum ori ministrat; manus est quæ præclaris enitet factis, quæ conciliatrix divinæ gratiæ sacris Inferitur altaribus, per quam offerimus & sumimus sacramenta cœlestia. Manus est quæ operatur pariter acque dispensat divina mysteria, cujus vocabulo non dedignatus est se Dei Filius declarari, dicente David, *Dextra Domini exaltavit me*. Manus est quæ fecit omnia, sicut dixit Deus omnipotens, *Nonne manus mea fecit hæc?* S. Ambros. Hexam. l. 6. c. 9.

Again, because the most honourable place amongst men is the right hand (as when *Bathsheba* went unto King *Solomon*, he sate down on his throne, and caused a seat to be set for the Kings mother, and she sate on his right hand) therefore the *right hand* of God signifies the glorious majesty of God. 1 Kings 2. 19.

Thirdly, because the gifts of men are given and received by the hands of men, and every perfect gift comes from the Father of lights, therefore the *right hand* of God is the place of cœlestial happiness and perfect felicity; ac-

Psal. 16. 11.

cording to that of the Psalmist, *In thy presence is fulness of joy, at thy right hand pleasures for ever more.*

Matt. 27. 64.

Mark 14. 62.

Luke 22. 69.

† Secundum consuetudinem nostram illi confessus offertur qui aliquo opere

perfecto honoris gratia promeretur ut sedeat. Ita ergo & homo Jesus Christus passione sua diabolum superans, resurrectione sua inferna referans, tanquam perfecto opere ad celos victor adveniens, audit a Deo Patre. *Sede ad dextram meam.* *Max. Taurin.* Hom. 1. de Pentecoste. ^a Heb. 1. 3. ^b Heb. 8. 1.

* Ad dex-

tram intelli-

gendum est

dictam esse in summa beatitudine, ubi iustitia & pax & gaudium est, *S. Aug. de Fide & Symb.* Quid est Patris dextera, nisi illa æterna ineffabilisque felicitas quo pervenit Filius hominis, etiam carnis immortalitate percepta? *Idem contra Serm. Arrian.* Beatus est à beatitudine, quæ dextera Patris vocatur; ipsius beatitudinis nomen est dextera Patris, *De Symb. ad Catech.* Salus temporalis & carnalis in sinistra est, salus æterna cum Angelis in dextra est. Ideo jam in ipsa immortalitate positus Christus dicitur sedere ad dextram Dei. Non enim Deus habet in seipso dextram aut sinistram; sed dextera Dei dicitur felicitas illa, quæ quoniam ostendi non potest tale nomen accipit, *S. Aug. in 1^a Isai. 137.*

Rom. 8. 34.

1 Pet. 3. 22.

As for the other part of the phrase, that is, his *session*, we must not look upon it as determining any posture of his body in the heavens, correspondent to the inclination and curvation of our limbs. For we reade in the Scriptures a more general term which signifies onely his being in heaven, without any expression of the particular manner of his pretence. So *S. Paul*, *Who is even at the right hand of God*; and *S. Peter*, *Who is gone into heaven, and is at the right hand of God.* Beside, we find him expressed in another position then that of *Session*: for *Stephen looking stedfastly into heaven, saw the glory of God, and Jesus standing on the right hand of God: And said, Behold, I see the heavens opened, and the Son of man standing on the right hand of God.* He appeared standing unto *Stephen*, whom we express sitting in our Creed; but this is rather a difference of the occasion, then a diversity of position. He appeared † standing to *Stephen* as ready to assist him, as ready to plead for him, as ready to receive him: and he is oftner expressed *sitting*, not for any positional variation, but for the variety of his effect, and operation.

† Επει το
ειπεν καθε-
δης οριστικον
αυτου ις
τις τ' επι
τ' αναστασιως
κινη λ' οριζοντι
επισιν αυτων ικανος,
S. Chrys. Hom. 18. in Acta.

Si major gratia & manifestior intelligentia in Novo est quam in Vetere Testamento, quare Esaias Propheta sedentem in throno Majestatis vidit Deum Sabaoth, in novo autem Stephanus primus Martyr stantem se vidisse ait Jesum à dextris Dei? Quid est istud, ut hic subjectus videatur post triumphos, & illic quasi dominus antequam vinceret? Prout causa erat fecisse, ita & Dominus se ostendit. Prophetæ enim visus est quasi rex corripiens plebem, & hoc se ostendit quod erat, hoc est, sedentem, in pace enim erat causa divinitatis ejus. Stephano autem ut stans appareret fecit calumnia Judæorum. In Stephano autem Salvatoris causa vim patiebatur. Ideo sedente Judice Deo stans apparuit, quasi qui causam diceret; & quia bona causa ejus est, ad dextram Judicis erat; Omnis qui causam dicit, stet necesse est, *S. Aug. Quest. in Novum Test. 88.* Sedere judicantis est, stare vero pugnantis vel adjuvantis. Stephanus ergo in labore certaminis positus, stantem vidit quem adiutorem habuit. Sed hunc post ascensionem Marcus sedere scribit, quia post ascensionis suæ gloriam Judex in fine videbitur, *Greg. Homil. 29. in Evang. Maximus Taurin. de Pentecoste Homil. 1. moves the Question,* Quæ sit ratio quod idem Dominus à David sedens Prophetatur, stans vero à Stephano prædicatur? *and then renders this reason,* Ut modo ejus omnipotentia, modo misericordia describatur. Nam utique pro potestate regis sedere dicitur, pro bonitate intercessoris stare suggeritur. Ait enim beatus Apostolus, quia *Advocatum habemus apud Patrem Jesum Christum.* Judex est igitur Christus cum residet, Advocatus cum assurgit. Judex plane Judæis, Advocatus Christianis. Hic enim stans apud Patrem Christianorum licet peccantium causas exorat; ibi residet cum Patre Phariseorum persequentium peccata condemnans. Illis indignans vehementer ulciscitur; his interveniens leniter miserequitur. Hic stat ut suscipiat Stephani Martyris spiritum; ibi residet ut condemnet Judæi proditoris admissum.

This

This phrase then to *fit*, preſcinding from the corporal poſture of ſeſſion, may ſignifie no more then habitation, poſſeſſion, permanſion, and continuances as the ſame word in the † Hebrew and Greek languages often ſignifies. And † יושב *which properly ſignifieth to fit, is familiarly uſed for permanſit, and habitavit: as* thus our Saviour is ſet down at the right hand of God in heaven, becauſe he which dwelt with uſ before on earth, is now aſcended up into heaven, and hath taken his manſion or habitation there; and ſo hath he ſeated himſelf, and * dwelleth in the higheſt heavens.

† **יָשַׁב** which properly signifieth to sit, is familiarly used for per-mansit, and habitavit; as *Jud. 5. 17.*

[illegible]

Again, the Notion of *sitting* implieth rest, quietness and indisturbance; according to that promise in the Prophet, *They shall sit every man under his fig-tree, and none shall make them afraid.* So Christ is ascended into heaven, where resting from all pains and sorrows, he is seated free from all disturbance and opposition; God having placed him at his right hand, untill he hath made his enemies his footstool.

Thirdly, this *sitting* implieth yet more then quietness or continuance, even † dominion, soveraignty, and Majesty; as when *Solomon* sat in the throne of his Eather, he raigned over *Israel* after the death of his Father. And thus *Christ* is set down at the right hand of the throne of God. And *S. Paul* did well interpret those words of the Prophet, *Sit thou on my right hand, untill I make thine enemies thy footstool*, saying, *He must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet.*

† Ipsam verbum *sedere*
regni significat potestatem, S. Hier.
Com. ad Eph.
6. i. v. 19.
Heb. 1. 1. 2.
Psal. 110. 1.
i Cor. 15. 25.
^a *Prov. 20. 8.*
^b *Isa. 16. 5.*
* *Sedere* quod dicitur Deus non membrorum positionem sed iudicariam significat potestatem, quia illa Majestas nunquam caret, semper

Fourthly, this *sitting* doth yet more properly and particularly imply the right of Judicature, and so especially expresseth ^a *a King that sitteth in the throne of Judgment*; as it is written, ^b *In mercy shall the throne be established, and he shall sit upon it in truth, in the tabernacle of David, judging and seeking judgment, and hasting righteousness.* And so Christ ^{*} sitting at the right hand of God is manifested and declared to be the great Judge of the quick and the dead. Thus to *sit* doth not signifie any peculiar inclination or flexion, any determinate location or position of the body, but to be in heaven with permanence of habitation, happiness of condition, regal and judiciary power; as in other † Authors such significations are usuall.

digna dignis tribuendo; quamvis in extremo judicio multo manifestius inter homines Unigeniti Dei Filii Judicis vivorum & mortuorum clarius indubitata effulgebit, *S. Aug. de Fidē & Symb. c. 7.* Hoc quod dicitur Filius sedere ad dextram Patris, de monstrat quod ipse homo, quem suscepit Christus, potestatem accepit Judicantis, *Ansb. l. 3. de Symb. ad Catechum.* *† Mfrt anciently sedere did signifie no more then esse, wch in any place; as Servius noteth on that place of Virgil Aeneid. 9.* Lucum forte parentis Piliuni Turnus sacrata vultesse sedebat. Sedebat, ut Alper dicit, erat. Quae clausula antiqua est, & de usu remota. *And then he goes on to shew that sedere is taken for that which men were wont to doe sitting.* Secundum Plautum autem sedere est consilium capere, qui inducit in Mostellaria servum dicentem; *Sine iuxta aram sedeam & dabo meliora consilia.* Sed secundum Augures Sedere est augurium capere: Namque post designatas caeli partes a sedentibus captabantur auguria. Quod & supra ipse ostendit latenter, inducens Picum solum sedentem; ut, *Parvaeque sedebat Succinthus trabea*, quod est augurium, cum alios stantes induxit. Ergo Sedebat, aut erat, aut consilia capiebat, aut augurabatur.

Rev. 5.12.

Math. 28.18.

Phil. 2.8, 9,
10.

The importance of the language being thus far improved, at last we find the substance of the Doctrine, which is, that sitting at the right hand of God was our Mediators solemn entry upon his Regal Office, as to the execution of that full Dominion which was due unto him. For *worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power and riches and wisdom, and strength and honour and glory and blessing.* Wherefore *Christ* after his death and resurrection saith, *All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth.* For because he humbled himself and became obedient unto death, even the death of the Cross, Therefore God hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name; That at the name of *Jesus* every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth. And this obedience and submission was and is due unto him, because God raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principalities and powers, and might and dominion, and every name that is named, not onely in this world but also in that which is to come; and hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be the head over all things to the Church. *Ep. 1: 20: 21:*

2 Sam. 7.16.

Ps. 132.12.

There was an exprefs promise made by God to *David*, *Thine house and thy Kingdom shall be established for ever before thee, thy throne shall be established for ever.* This promise strictly and literally taken was but conditionall: and the condition of the promise is elsewhere expressed, *Of the fruit of thy body will I set upon thy throne. If thy children will keep my Covenant and my testimony that I shall teach them, their children also shall sit upon thy throne for evermore.* Notwithstanding this promise this Kingdom of *David* was intercepted, nor was his family continued in the throne: part of the Kingdom was first rent from his posterity, next the regality it self; and when it was restored, translated to another family: and yet we cannot say the promise was not made good, but onely ceased in the obligation of a promise, because the condition was not performed. The posterity of *David* did not keep the covenant and testimony of their God, and therefore the throne of *David* was not by an uninterrupted lineal succession established to perpetuity.

Luk. 1.32,
33.

† Jer. 30.9.

Ezech. 37.

24, 25.

Hos. 3.5.

Ezech. 34.23,

24.

1 Sam. 16.13.

2 Sam. 2.4.

But yet in a larger and better sense, after these intermissions, the throne of *David* was continued. When they had sinned and lost their right unto the crown, the kingdom was to be given unto him who never sinned, and consequently could never lose it; and he being of the seed of *David*, in him the throne of *David* was without interception or succession continued. Of him did the Angel *Gabriel* speak at his conception, *The Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his Father David, and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever, and of his Kingdom there shall be no end.* Thus the throne of *Christ* is called the throne of *David*, because it was promised unto *David*, and because the Kingdom of *David* was a type, resemblance and representation of it; insomuch that *Christ* himself in respect of this kingdom is † often called *David*, as particularly in that promise, *I will set up one shepherd over them, and he shall feed them, even my servant David; he shall feed them, and he shall be their shepherd. And I the Lord will be their God, and my servant David a Prince among them.*

Now as *David* was not onely first designed but also anointed King over *Israel*, and yet had no possession of the Crown; Seven years he continued anointed by *Samuel*, and had no share in the Dominion; seven years after he continued anointed in *Hebron* onely King over the tribe of *Judah*; at last he was received by all the Tribes, and so obtained full and absolute regal power over all *Israel*, and seated himself in the royal city of *Jerusalem*: So *Christ* was born King of the *Jews*, and the conjunction of his humane nature with his divine in the union of his person was a sufficient unction to his Regal Office,

fice, yet as the Son of man he exercised no such dominion, professing that his *Kingdom was not of this world*; but after he rose from the dead, then as it were in *Hebron* with his own Tribe he tells the Apostles, *All power is given unto him*, and by virtue thereof, gives them injunctions; and at his ascension he enters into the *Jerusalem* above, and there sits down at the right hand of the throne of God, and so makes a solemn entry upon the full and entire dominion over all things; then could S. Peter say, *Let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus whom ye have crucified both Lord and Christ.* Acts 2. 36.

The immediate effect of this Regal power, the proper execution of this Office, is the subduing of all his Enemies; For he is *set down on the right hand of God, from henceforth expecting till his enemies be made his foot-stool.* Heb. 10. 12. 13. This was the ancient custom of the Oriental conquerours, to tread upon the necks of their subdued enemies; as when *Josuah* had the five Kings as his prisoners, he said unto the men of war which went with him, *Come near, put your feet upon the necks of them.* Jos. 10. 24. Thus to signify the absolute and total conquest of *Christ*, and the dreadful Majesty of his throne, all his enemies are supposed to lie down before him, and he set his feet upon them.

The Enemies of *Christ* are of two kinds, either Temporal or Spiritual; The Temporal enemies I call such as visibly and actually oppose him, and his Apostles, and all those which profess to believe in his name. Such especially and principally were the *Jews*, who rejected, persecuted and crucified him; who after his Resurrection, scourged, stoned, and despightfully used his disciples; who tried all ways and means imaginable to hinder the propagation, and dishonour the profession of Christianity. A part of his Regal Office was to subdue these enemies, and he set down on the right hand of God that they might be made his foot-stool: which they suddenly were according to his prediction, *There be some standing here which shall not taste of death till they see the son of man coming in his Kingdom.* Matt. 16. 28. For within few years the Temple, the City, and the whole Polity of the *Jews* were destroyed for ever in a revenging manner by the hands of the *Romans*, which they made use of to crucifie the Lord of life. The *Romans* themselves were the next enemies, who first complied with the *Jews* in *Christ's* crucifixion, and after in defence of their heathen Deities endeavoured the extirpation of Christianity by successive persecutions. These were next to be made the foot-stool of the King of Kings, and so they were, when *Rome* the regnant City, the head of that vast Empire, was taken and sacked; when the Christians were preserved and the Heathens perished; when the worship of all their Idols ceased, and the whole Roman Empire marched under the banner of Christianity. In the same manner all those persons and Nations whatsoever which openly oppose and persecute the name of *Christ*, are enemies unto this King, to be in due time subdued under him, and when he calleth to be slain.

The Spiritual Enemies of this King are of another nature; such as by an invisible way make opposition to *Christ's* dominion, as Sin, Satan, Death. Every one of these hath a Kingdom of its own, set up and opposed to the Kingdom of *Christ*. The Apostle hath taught us, that *sin hath reigned unto death*; and hath commanded us not to let it reign in our mortal bodies, that we should obey it in the lusts thereof. There is therefore a dominion and Kingdom of sin set up against the throne of the immaculate Lamb. Satan would have been like the most high, and being cast down from heaven, hath erected his throne below; he is the Prince of this world: the spirit which now worketh in the children of disobedience is the Prince of the power of the air; and thus the Rom. 5. 21. Job. 1. 13. Eph. 2. 2. & 6. 12.

rulers of the darkness of this world oppose themselves to *the true light of the world*. Death also hath its dominion, and, as the Apostle speaks, *reigned from Adam to Moses*; even by one offence death reigned by one, and so set up a ruling and a regal power against *the Prince of life*.

For the destruction of these powers was *Christ* exalted to the right hand of God, and by his Regal office doth he subdue and destroy them all. And yet this destruction is not so universal, but that Sin, Satan and Death shall still continue. 'Tis true he shall *put down all rule and authority and power*, but this amounts not so much to a total destruction, as to an absolute subjection: for as he is *able*, so will he *subdue all things unto himself*. The principal end of the Regal office of the Mediator is the effectual redemption and actual salvation of all those whom God hath given him, and whosoever or whatsoever opposeth the salvation of these is by that opposition constituted and become an Enemy of *Christ*. And because this Enmity is grounded upon that opposition, therefore so far as any thing opposeth the salvation of the sons of God, so far it is an Enemy, and no farther: And consequently, *Christ* by sitting at the right hand of God hath obtained full and absolute power utterly to destroy those three spiritual enemies so far as they make this opposition; and farther then they do oppose they are not destroyed by him, but subdued to him: whatsoever hindereth and obstructeth the bringing of his own into his kingdom, for the demonstration of God's mercy is abolished; but whatsoever may be yet subservient to the demonstration of his justice is continued.

Christ then as King destroyeth the power of sin in all those which belong unto his Kingdom, annihilating the guilt thereof by the virtue of his death, destroying the dominion thereof by his actual grace, and taking away the spot thereof by grace habitual. But in the reprobate and damned souls the spot of sin remaineth in its perfect die, the dominion of sin continueth in its absolute power, the guilt of sin abideth in a perpetual obligation to eternal pains: but all this in subjection to his throne, the glory of which consisteth as well in punishing Rebellion as rewarding Loyalty.

Again, *Christ* sitting on the right hand of God destroyeth all the strength of Satan and the powers of Hell: by virtue of his death, perpetually presented to his Father, he *destroyeth him that had the power of death, that is, the Devil*. But the actual destruction of these powers of darkness hath reference onely to the Elect of God. In them he preventeth the *miles*; those he taketh out of the *snare*, in them he destroyeth the *works*, those he preserveth from the *condemnation of the Devil*. He freeth them here from the prevailing power of Satan by his grace, he freeth them hereafter from all possibility of any infernal opposition by his glory. But still the reprobate and damned souls are continued slaves unto the powers of hell; and he which sitteth upon the throne delivereth them to the Devil and his Angels, to be tormented with and by them for ever; and this power of Satan still is left as subservient to the demonstration of the divine justice.

Thirdly, *Christ* sitting on the throne of God at last destroyeth death it self: For *the last enemy which shall be destroyed is death*. But this destruction reacheth no farther then removing of all power to hinder the bringing of all such persons as are redeemed actually by *Christ* into the full possession of his heavenly Kingdom. He will *ransom them from the power of the grave*, he will *redeem them from death*. O death, he will be thy plague; O grave, he will be thy destruction. The trump shall sound, the graves shall open, the dead shall live, the bodies shall be framed again out of the dust, and the souls which left them shall be reunited to them, and all the sons of men shall return

return to life, and *death shall be swallowed up in victory*. The sons of God ^{1 Cor. 15. 54.} shall then be made compleatly happy both in soul and body, never again to be separated, but to inherit eternal life. Thus he who sitteth at the right hand of God *hath abolished death, and brought life and immortality to light*. But to the Reprobate and damned persons death is not destroyed but improved. They rise again indeed to life, and so the first death is evacuated; but that life to which they rise is a *second*, and a far worse *death*. And thus *Christ* is set down at the right hand of God that he might subdue all things to himself.

The Regal power of *Christ*, as a branch of the Mediatourship, is to continue all till those Enemies be subdued. *For he must reign till he hath put all* ^{1 Cor. 15. 25.} *enemies under his feet*. ^{Heb. 2. 8.} But now we see not yet all things put under him, Therefore he must still continue there: and this necessity is grounded upon the promise of the Father, and the expectation of the Son. *Sit thou on my right hand, untill I make thine enemies thy foot-stool*, saith the Father; upon which words we may ground as well the continuation as the session. Upon this promise of the Father the Son *sate down at the right hand of God, from henceforth expecting till his enemies be made his foot-stool*. ^{Psal. 110. 1.} Being then the promise of God cannot be evacuated, being the expectation of *Christ* cannot be frustrated, it followeth that our Mediatour shall exercise the Regal power at the right hand of God till all opposition shall be subdued. ^{Heb. 10. 12, 13.}

When all the enemies of *Christ* shall be subdued, when all the chosen of God shall be actually brought into his Kingdom, when those which refused him to rule over them, shall be slain, that is, when the whole office of the Mediator shall be completed and fulfilled, then every branch of the execution shall cease. As therefore there shall no longer continue any act of the Prophetical part to instruct us, nor any act of the Priestly part to intercede for us, so there shall be no further act of this Regal power of the Mediator necessary to defend and preserve us. The beatifical vision shall succeed our information and instruction, a present fruition will prevent oblation and intercession, and perfect security will need no actual defence and protection. As therefore the general notion of a Mediator ceaseth when all are made one, because *a Mediator is not a Mediator of one*; so every part or branch of that Mediatorship, as such, must also cease, because that unity is in all parts compleat. *Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom of God, even the Father, when he shall have put down all rule and all authority and power*. *For when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that hath put all things under him, that God may be all in all*. ^{Gal. 3. 20.}

Now though the Mediatorship of *Christ* be then resigned, because the end thereof will then be performed; though the Regal Office as part of that Mediatorship be also resigned with the whole; yet we must not think that *Christ* shall cease to be a King, or lose any of the power and honour which before he had. The dominion which he hath was given him as a reward for what he suffered: and certainly the reward shall not cease when the work is done. He hath promised to make us Kings and Priests, which honour we expect in heaven, believing we shall *reign with him* for ever, and therefore for ever must believe him King. *The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of the Lord, and of his Christ, and he shall reign for ever and ever*, not onely to the modified eternity of his Mediatorship, so long as there shall be need of Regal power to subdue the enemies of God's elect; but also to the complete eternity of the duration of his humanity, which for the future is coeternall to his Divinity. ^{Videamus an traditio regni defectio sit intelligenda regnandi, ut quod tradidit Filius Patri tradendo non cessat, S. Hieron. l. 1. c. 11. 2 Tim. 2. 12. Rev. 11. 15.}

The very name of † *head* hath the signification not onely of dominion but of union, and therefore while we look upon him at the right hand of God we see our selves in heaven. This is the special promise which he hath made us since he set down there, *To him that overcommeth will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also overcame and am set down with my Father in his throne.* How should we rejoyce, yea rather how should we * fear and tremble at so great an honour!

† This is the exclamation of S. Chrysostom upon those words of S. Paul, Βασιλεὺς τῶν παλίων καὶ τῶν νεωτέρων ἐκκλησίαν ἀνίστασθαι ὡς ὁ πατήρ ἐκάθισεν ἐν τῷ θρόνῳ.

ἐκλον μὴ χαλῆς, εἰς ἡλίου ἀπὸ ἀνίστασθαι μέγα καὶ αὐτῷ ἐκκαθίστην εἰς ἐκείνον τὸν θρόνον· ἐν δὲ καὶ ἡ καρδία ἐκείνη καὶ τὸ σῶμα· ἀνὴρ δὲ μίσην διέχευε) ἡ καρδία καὶ τὸ σῶμα· εἰ δὲ διέχευε, ἔκ δὲ ἐν τῷ σῶμα, ἐκ δὲ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ, Hom. 3. in Epist. ad Ephes.
* Rev. 3. 21. * Ἐννοεῖ τὸν θρόνον τὸ βασιλικόν, ἐννοεῖ τὴν πῦλιν τὴν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ· τὸ καὶ γέννησις, ὡς βασιλεὺς, καὶ ἀλλοῦ ἡμῶν φωνῆσαι δυνάσθαι. Εἰ δὲ μὴ πάντα λέγει, τὸ πᾶν δυνάσθαι πᾶσι ἀναξίως ἐπεδιδόκει καὶ ἡ χάρις, πᾶσα ἐκ δὲ ἐν ἐκείνῳ κλάσσει, πᾶσα πτωχεύει; ἐννοεῖται τὸ ἐγγὺς ἡ καρδία (καὶ δὲ) (τὸ τὸ μόνον καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πᾶν ὅσον) πᾶσα ἐκ δὲ ἐκείνῳ ἰδού, Idem ibidem.

Thirdly, the belief of *Christ's* glorious Session is most necessary in respect of the immediate consequence, which is his most gracious Intercession. Our Saviour is ascended as the true *Melchisedec*, not onely as the *King of Salem* Heb. 7. 1. the Prince of peace, but also as the *Priest of the most high God*; and whereas every Priest according to the law of *Moses*, stood daily ministering and offering Heb. 10. 11. oftentimes the same sacrifices which could never take away sins, this man after he had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God. And now *Christ* being set down in that power and majesty, though the sacrifice be but once offered, yet the virtue of it is perpetually advanced by his Session, which was founded on his passion: For he is entered into heaven it self, now to appear in the presence of God for us. Thus, if any man sin, we have 1 Jobn 2. 1. an Advocate with the Father, *Jesus Christ the righteous*. And he is able also to Heb. 7. 25. save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them. What then remaineth to all true believers but that triumphant exclamation of the Apostle, *Who shall lay any thing to the charge of Gods elect?* It is God that justifieth: who is he that condemneth? It is *Christ* that died, yea rather that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us. For he which was accepted in his oblation: and therefore sat down on God's right hand, to improve this acceptation continues his intercession: and having obtained all power by virtue of his humiliation, representeth them both in a most sweet commixtion; by an humble omnipotency, or omnipotent humility, appearing in the presence, and presenting his * postulations at the throne of God.

* S. Augustin discourse upon that place of S. Paul, 1 Tim. 2. 1.

I exhort that first of all supplications, prayers and intercessions be made for all men, observeth what is the nature of Intercession. Pro Interpellationibus autem quod nostri, secundum codices credo vestros postulationes posuisti. Hæc interim duo, id est, quod alii postulationes, alii interpellationes interpretati sunt, unum verbum transferre voluerunt, quod Græcus habet ἐν τῷ ἑαυτοῦ. Et profecto advertis: Sed nosti aliud esse interpellare, aliud postulare. Non enim solemus dicere, postulant interpellaturi, sed interpellant postulaturi. Veruntamen ex vicinitate verbum usurpatum, cui propinquitas ipsa impetrat intellectum, non est velut censoria notatione culpandum. Nam & de ipso Domino Jesu Christo dictum est, quod interpellat pro nobis. Numquid interpellat, & non etiam postulat? Imo vero quia postulat pro eo positum est interpellat. Evidenter quippe alibi de eo dicitur, Si quis peccaverit, Advocatum habemus ad Patrem, Jesum Christum justum, ipse est exoratio pro peccatis nostris. Quamquam fortassis codices apud vos etiam in eo loco de Domino Jesu Christo non habent interpellat pro nobis, sed postulat pro nobis. In Græco enim, quo verbo hic positæ sunt interpellationes, quas ipse posuisti postulationes, ipsum & illic verbum est, ubi scriptum est, interpellat pro nobis. Cum igitur & qui precatur oret, & qui orat precetur, & qui interpellat Deum ad hoc interpellat ut oret & precetur, &c. Epist. 59. ad Paulinum, Quest. 5.

Having thus explicated the Session of our Saviour, we are next to consider the Description of him at whose right hand he is set down; which seems to be delivered in the same terms, with which the Creed did first begin, *I believe in God the Father Almighty*, and indeed, as to the expression of his essence, it is the same name of *God*; as to the setting forth his Relation, it is the same name of *Father*; but as to the adjoining attribute, though it be the same word, it is not the same notion of *Almighty*. What therefore we have spoken

cipal Agent, or the first of Causes. † There is nothing in the whole circumference of the Universe, but hath some kind of activity, and consequently some power to act; (for nothing can be done without a power to doe it:) and as all their entities flow from the first of beings, so all their several and various powers flow from the first of powers: and as all their beings cannot be conceived to depend of any but an infinite essence, so all those powers cannot proceed from any but an infinite power.

ἡ δὲ ἰσχύς, ἢ λογικὴ, ἢ αἰσθητικὴ, ἢ ζωτικὴ ἢ ὑποδοχὴ δυνάμεων ἔχει. Καὶ αὐτὸς, ἐν ἑαυτῷ ὁπτεῖν, τὸ εἶναι δυνάμει, ὡς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸς δυνάμει. Dionys. Areopag. De Divin. Nom. cap. 8.

† Ἡ ἀπειρο-
δυναμία ὁ
Θεὸς διὰ τὸ
εἶναι πάντα τὰ
ὄντα ὑποφύει
ἐν ἑαυτῷ ὡς
ἐν ὄντων ὁ
παντελὴς
ἀφ᾽ ἑρῆ το
ἔχειν πάντα
δυνάμει, ὡς

Secondly, God may be called Omnipotent, * because there can be no resistance made to his power, no opposition to his will, no rescue from his hands. *The Lord of hosts hath purposed, and who shall disannul it? his hand is stretched out, and who shall turn it back?* ^b *He doth according to his will, in the army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth: and none can stay his hand, or say unto him, what dost thou?* According to the degrees of power in the Agent and the Resistant is an action performed or hindered; if there be more degrees of power in the Resistant then the Agent, the action is prevented; if fewer, it may be retarded or debilitated, not wholly hindered or suppressed. But if there be no degree of power in the Resistant in reference to the Agent, then is the action totally vigorous; and if in all the powers beside that of God there be not the least degree of any resistance, we must acknowledge that power of his being above all opposition, to be infinite. As *Jehosaphat* said, ^c *In thine hand, O God, is there not power and might, so that none is able to withstand thee?* From hence there is no difficulty with God to perform any thing; no greater endeavour or activity to produce the greatest then the least of creatures; but an equal facility in reference unto all things; which cannot be † imagined but by an infinite excess of power above and beyond all resistance.

* Neque enim veraciter ob aliud vocatur Omnipotens, nisi quia quicquid vult potest; nec voluntate cuiuspiam creature voluntatis omnipotentis impeditur effectus, S. Aug. Enchiridion ad Lact. cap. 96.

^a 1/4. 14. 27.
^b Dan. 4. 35.
^c 2 Chr. 20. 69.

Thirdly, God is yet more properly called Omnipotent, because his own active power extendeth it self to * all things; neither is there any thing imaginably possible which he cannot doe. Thus when God several ways had declared his power unto *Job*, ^d *Job answered the Lord and said, I know that thou canst doe every thing.* Now that must needs be infinite activity which answereth to all kinds of possibility. Thus the power of God is infinite extensively, in respect of its object, which is all things; for whatsoever effects there be of his power, yet still there can be more produced; intensively, in respect of the action, or perfection of the effect produced; for whatsoever addition of perfection is possible is within the sphere of God's omnipotency. The object then of the power of God is whatsoever is simply and absolutely possible, whatsoever is in it self such as that it may be; and so possible every thing is which doth not imply a contradiction. Again, whatsoever implieth a contradiction is impossible, and therefore is not within the object of the power of God, because impossibility is the contradiction of all power. For that is said to imply a contradiction, which if it were, it would necessarily follow that the same thing would be and not be. But it is impossible for the same thing both to be and not to be at the same time and in the same respect: and therefore whatsoever implieth a contradiction is impossible. From whence it followeth, that it may be truly said, God cannot effect that which involveth a contradiction, but with no derogation from his power: and it may be as truly said, God can effect whatsoever involveth not a contradiction, which is the expression of an infinite power.

† Nisi omnipotens esset, non una eademque facilitate summa atque inaccessibilis, Fulgent. de Fide ad Petrum, cap. 3.
* Quis est omnipotens nisi qui omnia potest? S. Aug. de Trin. 4. c. 7.
^d Job 42. 1, 2.

Now an action may imply a contradiction two ways, either in respect of the

the Object, or in respect of the Agent. In respect of the object it may imply a contradiction Immediately or Consequentially. That doth imply a contradiction immediately, which plainly and in terms doth signifie a repugnance and so destroys it self, as for the same thing to be and not to be, to have been and not to have been. And therefore it must be acknowledged that it is not in the power of God † to make that not to have been, which hath already been : but that is no derogation to God's power, because not within the object of any power. And he may certainly have all power, who hath not that which belongeth to no power. Again, that doth imply a contradiction consequentially, which in appearance seemeth not to be impossible, but by necessary consequence if admitted, leadeth infallibly to a contradiction. As that one body should be at the same time in two distinct places, speaks no repugnance in terms; but yet by consequence it leads to that which is repugnant in it self; which is that the same body is but one body, and not but one. Being then a covert and consequential contradiction is as much and as truly a contradiction as that which is open and immediate, it followeth that it is as impossible to be effected, and therefore comes not under the power of God.

† Τὸ ποιεῖν
ἐκ τοῦ οὐδένος
μὴ δυνατόν
ὁ δὲ ὁπότεν Ἀ-
γάθων. Μὴ
ἔστι αὐτῷ
ὁδε σχεδόν-
τα. Ἀλλ' ἡ
ταυτὴ αὐτῷ
ἀντὶ τῆς ἀγα-
θότητος. Ἀριστ.
Ethic. End.
l. 5. c. 2.

Quisquis di-
cit, Si omni-
potens est
Deus, faciat

ut quæ facta sunt facta non fuerint, non vider hoc se dicere, si omnipotens est faciat ut ea quæ vera sunt eo ipso quo vera sunt falsa sint, S. Aug. contra Faustum, l. 26. c. 5. It is granted therefore to be true, which Pliny objects, Deum non facere ut qui vixit non vixerit, qui honores gessit, non gesserit; as this proves nothing against omnipotency because it is no act of possibility. Had the Act objected been feasible, and God had not the power to effect it, then had he wanted some power, and consequently had not been Omnipotent. But being it is not want of power in the Agent, but of possibility in the Object, it proveth no deficiency in God.

That doth imply a Contradiction in respect of the Agent, which is repugnant to his essential perfection; for being every action floweth from the essence of the Agent, whatsoever is totally repugnant to that essence, must involve a contradiction as to the Agent. Thus we may say God cannot sleep, God cannot want, God cannot † die; he cannot sleep whose being is spiritual; he cannot want, whose nature is all-sufficient; he cannot die, who is essentially and necessarily existent. Nor can that be a diminution of his Omnipotency, the contrary whereof would be a proof of his impotency, a demonstration of his infirmity. Thus it is impossible for God to * lie, to whom we say nothing is impossible; and, he who can do all things, cannot deny himself. Because a lie is repugnant to the perfection of Veracity, which is essential unto God as necessarily following from his infinite knowledge, and infinite sanctity. We who are ignorant may be deceived, we who are sinfull may deceive; but it is repugnant to that nature to be deceived which is no way subject unto ignorance; it is contradictory to that essence to deceive, which is no way capable of sin. For as it is a plain contradiction to know all things and to be ignorant of any thing: so is it to know all things and to be deceived; as it is an evident contradiction, to be infinitely holy, and to be sinfull, so is it to be infinitely holy and deceive. But it is impossible for any one to lie, who can neither deceive nor be deceived. Therefore it is a manifest contradiction to say that God can lie, and consequently it is no derogation from his Omnipotency, that he cannot. Whatsoever then God cannot doe, whatsoever is impossible to him, doth not any way prove that he is not Almighty, but onely shew that the rest of his Attributes and perfections are as essential to him as his power; and as his power suffereth no resistance, so the rest of his perfections admit no repugnance. Well therefore may we conclude him absolutely † Omnipotent,

† Neque enim & vitam Dei & præscientiam Dei sub necessitate posuimus si dicamus, Necessè est Deum semper vivere & cuncta præscire, sicut nec potestas ejus minuitur, cum dicitur mori fallique non posse. Sic enim hoc non potest, ut potius, si posset, minoris esset utique potestatis Recte quippe Omnipotens dicitur qui tamen mori & falli non potest. Dicitur

enim Omnipotens faciendo quod vult non patiendo quod non vult. Quod si ei accideret, nequaquam esset Omnipotens. Unde propterea quædam non potest quia Omnipotens est, Aug. de Civ. Dei, l. 5. c. 10. Nam ego dico quanta non possit. Non potest mori, non potest peccare, non potest mentiri, non potest falli. Tanta non potest, quæ si posset non esset Omnipotens, Aurar. Serm. 119. ad Temp. * Heb. 6. 18. † Nunquid mentitur Deus? Sed non mentitur; quia impossibile est menti Deum. Impossibile autem istud nunquidnam infirmitatis est? Non utique; Nam quomodo omnia potest, si aliquid efficere non potest? Quid ergo ei impossibile? Illud utique quod naturæ ejus contrarium est, non quod virtutis arduum. Impossibile,

• Nor is it unusual in other Authors to make use of the word Omnipotens, rather in relation to the present occasion, then in reverence to the person who is said to be omnipotent; as is

observed by Servius upon that verse of Virgil, *Æneid.* 9. Jupiter omnipotens audacibus animum ceptis. Hoc epitheton interdum ad gloriam numinis ponitur, interdum ad causam dicentis. Namque hoc loco dicendo Omnipotens ostendit eum etiam his qui per se minus valent præstare posse virtutem.

Deut. 10. 7.

Luke 12. 5.

Gen. 17. 1.

1 Pet. 5. 6.

James 4. 12.

It is necessary to profess belief in God *Almighty*; First, because the acknowledgment of his Omnipotency begetteth that fear and reverence, submission and obedience which is due unto his infinite Majesty. Our God is a great God, a mighty, and a terrible; therefore terrible because mighty. *I will forewarn you, saith our Saviour, whom ye shall fear: Fear him which after he hath killed hath power to cast into hell, I say unto you, fear him.* Three times we are commanded to fear, and one onely reason rendred, but sufficient for a thousand fears, the power of him who is able eternally to punish us. God gave a general command to Abraham, and with it a powerfull perswasion to obedience, when he said unto him, *I am the Almighty God, walk before me and be thou perfect.* It was a rational advice which the Apostle giveth us. *Humble yourselves under the mighty hand of God, that he may exalt you in due time.* And it is a proper incentive to the observation of the law of God, to consider that he is the one Law-giver who is able to save and to destroy.

† This was the Argument which the Pythagoreans used, who believed many miraculous actions, which others looked upon as fabulous.

Because they would disbelieve nothing which was referred to the divine power, and the reason of that was because they thought all things possible to God, as we shewed before. Τὸν τοῦτον δὲ (saith Iamblichus, having related several strange actions either fabulous or miraculous) οὐκ ἀνέλεον μωδῶς ἀπομνημονεύοντες ὡς μωδῶς ἀνέλεον δὲ, καὶ ὡς τὸ θεῶν ἀνάγκη. And whereas others looked upon them as weak and simple people, for giving credit to such fabulous relations, οὐκ ἐστὶν μὴδὲ τὰ τοιαῦτα ἐκ αὐτῶν ἐνδείξεις νομίζοντες ἀλλὰ τὸ ἀνέλεον, Iamblich. de Vita Pythag. cap. 28.

Rom. 4. 20, 21.

Thirdly, it is not onely necessary in matters of bare faith, and notions of belief, but in respect of the active and operative reliance upon the promises of God. This was the particular confidence of Abraham the Father of the Faithfull, who staggered not at the promise of God through unbelief, but was strong in faith giving glory to God, and being fully perswaded that what he had promised he was able also to perform. The promises of God are therefore

* firm

* firm and sure, because he is both willing and able to perform them. We doubt or distrust the promises of men, either because we may fear they intend not to do what they have promised, or cannot do what they intend; in the first we may suspect them, because they are subject to iniquity; in the second, because they are liable to infirmity. But being God is of infinite sanctity, he cannot intend by breaking his promises to deceive us; therefore if he be also of infinite power, he must be able to perform what he intended, and consequently we can have no reason to distrust his promises. From whence every good Christian may say with the Apostle, *I know whom I have believed, and I am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him against that day.* I am assured that if I be a sheep and hear my Saviour's voice, the powers of darkness and the gates of hell can never prevail against me: for it was the voice of the Son of God, *My Father which gave them me is greater than all; and no man is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand.*

* Nulla est in promissis Dei fallitas, quia nulla est in faciendis difficultas aut impossibilitas, Fulgent. l. i. ad Moanm.

2 Tim. i. 12.

John 10: 29.

Lastly, the belief of God's Omnipotency is necessary to give life to our devotions. We ask those things from heaven which none but God can give, and many of them such, as if God himself were not *Almighty*, he could not effect. And therefore in that form of Prayer which *Christ* hath taught us, we conclude all our petitions unto the Father with that acknowledgment, *For thine is the Kingdom, the Power, and the Glory.* Nor can there be a greater encouragement in the midst of all our temptations, then that we are invited to call upon him in the day of trouble, *who is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think according to the power that worketh in us.*

Matt. 6: 13.

Eph. 3: 20.

After this Explication of our Saviour's Session, we may conclude what every Christian ought, and may be supposed to intend, when he maketh profession to believe that *Christ is set on the right hand of God the Father Almighty.* For thereby he is conceived to declare thus much, I assent unto this as a most infallible and necessary truth, that *Jesus Christ* ascending into the highest heavens, after all the troubles and sufferings endured here for our Redemption, did rest in everlasting happiness; he which upon earth had not a place to lay his head, did take up a perpetual habitation there, and sit down upon the throne of God, as a Judge, and as a King, according to his office of Mediator, unto the end of the world, according to that which he merited by his Mediatorship, to all eternity; which hand of God the Father Almighty signifieth an omnipotent power, able to do all things without any limitation, so they involve not a contradiction, either in themselves or in relation to his perfections. And thus I believe in *Jesus Christ* who sitteth at the right hand of God the Father Almighty.

ARTICLE VII.

*From * thence shall He come to Judge the quick and the Dead.*

* Or, from whence; the Latines sometimes inde, sometimes unde. And the Greek is ἐκ, unde, both in the ancient MS. in Sir Robert Cottons Library, and in the Creed of Marcellus. But ἐκ, unde, ἐκ, unde, in the later Ms. in Bennett

Colledge Library. Others neither ἐκ, unde, nor ἐκ, unde, but πάλιν, as Justine Martyr, Ἡμεῖς ἐκ τῆς γῆς καὶ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ἐκ τῆς θαλάσσης καὶ ἐκ πάντων ἀνθρώπων μέγας αὐτὸς Ἄδμ. ἀναστῆναι, ἐκ ἀναστάσεως οὐκ ἐκ τῆς γῆς, καὶ πάλιν ἐκ τῆς γῆς καὶ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ἐκ τῆς θαλάσσης καὶ ἐκ πάντων ἀνθρώπων μέγας αὐτὸς Ἄδμ. Dial. cum Tryphone. Others without inde or unde, only venturus, as the Nicene Creed, ἐρχόμενον κρίναι, others πάλιν ἐρχόμενον, or ἡ ἐκ τῆς γῆς καὶ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ἐκ τῆς θαλάσσης καὶ ἐκ πάντων ἀνθρώπων μέγας αὐτὸς Ἄδμ. and Fortunatus leaving out inde venturus, hath only judicaturus vivos & mortuos.

THis Article containeth in it four Particular Considerations, and no more; First, that *Christ*, who is gone from us, shall come again. Secondly, that the place from whence he shall then come is the highest heaven, to which he first ascended; for *from thence he shall come*. Thirdly, that the end for which he shall come, and the action which he shall perform when he cometh, is *to judge*; for *from thence he shall come to judge*. Fourthly, that the object of that Action, or the persons whom he shall judge, are all men, whither dead before; or then alive; for *from thence shall he come to judge the quick and the dead*.

For the illustration of the first Particular two things will be necessary, and no more; first, to shew that the promised *Messias* was to come again after he once was come; secondly, to declare how our *Jesus* (whom we have already proved once to have come as the true *Messias*) did promise and assure us of a second coming.

That the *Messias* was to come again, was not onely certainly, but copiously foretold; the Scriptures did often assure us of a second advent. As often as we reade of his griefs and humility, so often we were admonished of his coming to suffer: as often as we hear of his power and glory, so often we are assured of his coming to judge. We must not fanſie with the *Jews*, a double *Messias*, one the son of *Joseph*, the other of *David*; one of the tribe of *Ephraim*, the other of *Judah*; but we must take that for a certain truth, which they have made an occasion of their errour; that the *Messias* is twice to come, once in all humility, to suffer and die, as they conceived of their son of *Joseph*; and again in all glory, to govern and judge, as they expect the son of *David*. Particularly, *Enoch* the seventh from *Adam* prophesied of this Advent, saying, behold the Lord cometh with ten thousands of his Angels. And more particularly *Daniel* saw the Representation of his judiciary power and glory. *I saw in the night visions, and behold one like the Son of man, came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him before him. And there was given him dominion and glory, and a kingdom that all people, nations and languages should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed.* This Son of man the * *Jews* themselves confesse to be the promised *Messias*, and they take the words to signifie his coming, and so far give testimony to the truth, but then they evacuate the prediction by a false interpretation, saying that † if the *Jews* went on in their sins, then the *Messias* should come in humility, according to the description in *Zachary*, lowly and riding upon an ass; but if they pleased

Jude 14.

Dan. 7. 13, 14.

* R. Saadiah
Gaon ad lo-
cum, וְהָיָה

מִשִּׁיחַ
צִדְקָנוּ
כְּדִכְרוּ
נָא

לֹאֲדָנִי שֶׁב לִימִינִי In Bereshit Rabba, speaking of the Genealogy concluding (1 Chron. 3. 24.) with Anani the youngest of the seven sons of Eliocai, the Author asks this question, וְהָיָה מִשִּׁיחַ וְהָיָה מִיָּד וְהָיָה מִיָּד וְהָיָה מִיָּד and who is this Anani? and answers it thus, וְהָיָה מִשִּׁיחַ וְהָיָה מִיָּד וְהָיָה מִיָּד וְהָיָה מִיָּד This is the *Messias*, as it is written, Dan. 7. 13. I saw in the night visions, and behold one like the Son of man, came with Anani, that is, the clouds of heaven; Solomon Jarchi ad locum, אֲנָשׁ הוּא מֶלֶךְ הַמִּשְׁחָה, and Aben-Ezra ibidem, אָמַר רַב יְשׁוּעָה כִּי זֶה כָּכָה, אֲנָשׁ

אשר אדם הוא סוד המשיח נאמר כבר So the Author of Tzevor Hammor; **אנש המשיח ונבין הדבר :** The mystery of man is the mystery of the Messias; according to that of Daniel, he came as the Son of man. This place is mentioned for one of the **כתובין** which speak of the Messias, in the Midrash Tillim, Psal. 2. And the Midrash upon the 21st Psalm. **אך ברכיה בשם ר שמואל כתוב אחד אים עם ענני שמיא כבר אנש :** (speaking of the Messias). Indeed the Jews do so generally interpret this place of Daniel of the Messias, that they make it an Argument to prove that the Messias is not yet come, because no man hath yet come with the clouds of heaven. † This interpretation is delivered in libro Sanhedrim, **אך ברכיה בשם ר שמואל כתוב אחד אים עם ענני שמיא כבר אנש :** Idem etiam legitur in Mesebit Raba R. Moshe Haanashan, Gen. 49. 11. Thus they make the coming of Christ to depend upon their merit or demerit; whereas the promises of the Messias are absolute and irrevocable, depending only on the goodness of God, not to be evacuated or altered by the wickedness of man. Nay the unworthiness of the Jews which Christ found when he came in humility, is one special cause why he should come again in glory.

God, then he should come in glory, according to the description in the prophet *Daniel with the clouds of heaven*. Whereas these two descriptions are two several predictions, and therefore must be both fulfilled. From whence it followeth, that, being *Christ* is already come lowly and sitting upon an ass, therefore he shall come gloriously *with the clouds of heaven*. For if both those descriptions cannot belong to one and the same advent, as the Jews acknowledge, and both of them must be true, because equally prophetic; then must there be a double advent of the same *Messias*, and so his second coming was foretold.

That our *Jesus*, whom we have already proved to have come once into the world as the true *Messias*, shall come the second time, we are most assured. We have the testimony of the Angels, *This same Jesus which is taken up from you into heaven shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven.* Acts 1. 11. We have the promise of *Christ* himself to his Apostles, *If I go to prepare a place for you, I will come again and receive you unto my self: ye have heard how I said unto you, I go away and come again unto you.* John 14. 3. 28. He it is which from the beginning was to come; that express prophesie so represented him, *The Scorpion shall not depart from Judah until Shiloh come;* Gen. 49. 19. the name of *Shiloh* was obscure, but the notion of the *comer*, added to it, was most vulgar. According to this notion once *Christ* came, and being gone he keeps that notion still; he is to come again. *For yet a little while and he that shall come will come.* Heb. 10. 37. Our *Jesus* then shall come, and not onely so, but shall so come, as the *Messias* was foretold, after the same manner, in the same glory of the Father, as the *Son of man coming in his Kingdom*. This was expressed in the prophetic vision by coming *with clouds*, and in the same manner shall our *Jesus* come; For *Behold he cometh with clouds, and every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him.* known by that vulgar appellation *ἐπὶ νεφέλαις*, that is, he who is known by that vulgar appellation *ἐπὶ νεφέλαις*, he which did once come into the world to make that notion good, is still to be known by the same appellation, and therefore will come again.

This was it which made the Apostles ask that Question, Matt. 24. 3. When shall these things be, and what shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world? Matt. 16. 28. Rev. 1. 7. † As R. Saadiah Gaon upon that place of Dan. 7. 13. **עם ענני השמים הם מלאכי צבא השמים וזו היא רוב הגדולה שיתן תבורא למשיח :** The clouds of heaven they are the Angels of the host of heaven; this is the great magnificence and power which God shall give unto the Messias. From hence is that exposition in Midrash Tillim, Psal. 21. 7. **אך ברכיה בשם ר שמואל כתוב אחד אים עם ענני שמיא כבר אנש :** Rabbi Barachia said in the name of Rabbi Samuel, One Scripture faith (Dan. 7. 13.) And behold one like the son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. And another Scripture faith, (Jer. 33. 22.) and I will cause him to draw near and he shall approach unto me: Behold in what manner? The Angels shall bring him into the midst of them.

The place from whence he shall come is next to be considered, and is sufficiently expressed in the Creed by reflection upon the place whither he went when

when he departed from us ; For he *ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God*, and from thence shall he come : that is, from, and out of the highest heaven (where he now sitteth at the right hand of God) shall *Christ* hereafter come to judge both the quick and the dead. For him *must the heaven receive till the time of the restitution of all things* ; and when that time is fulfilled, from that heaven shall he come. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the Archangel and with the trump of God. Our conversation ought to be in heaven, because from thence we look for our Saviour the Lord Jesus. Our High-priest is gone up into the Holy of holies not made with hands, there to make an atonement for us ; therefore as the people of Israel stood without the Tabernacle expecting the return of Aaron, so must we look unto the heavens and expect *Christ* from thence ; when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty Angels. We do believe that *Christ* is set down on the right hand of God ; but we must also look upon him as coming thence, as well as sitting there : and to that purpose *Christ* himself hath joyned them together, saying, *Hereafter shall ye see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven.* Thus shall the Saviour of the world come from the right hand of power, in fulness of Majesty, from the highest heavens, as a demonstration of his sanctity : that by an undoubted authority, and unquestionable integrity, he might appear most fit to judge both the quick and the dead : which is the end of his second coming, and leads me to the third consideration, the act of his judging. From whence shall he come to judge.

For the explication of this Action, as it stands in this Article, three considerations will be necessary. First, how we may be assured that there is a Judgment to come, that any one shall come to judge. Secondly, in case we be assured that there shall be a Judgment, how it appeareth that he which is ascended into heaven, that is, that *Christ* shall be the Judge. Thirdly, in case we can be assured that we shall be judged, and that *Christ* shall judge us, it will be worthy our inquiry in what this judgment shall consist, how this action shall be performed : and more then this cannot be necessary to make us understand, that he shall come to judge.

That there is a Judgment to come after this life, will appear demonstrable, whether we consider our selves who are to undergoe it, or God who is to execute it. If we do but reflect upon the frame and temper of our own spirits, we cannot but collect and conclude from thence, that we are to give an account of our actions, and that a judgment hereafter is to pass upon us. There is in the soul of every man a Conscience, and whosoever it is, it giveth testimony to this truth. The antecedent or directive conscience tells us what we are to doe, and the subsequent or reflexive conscience warns us what we are to receive. Looking back upon the actions we have done, it either approves or condemns them ; and if it did no more, it would onely prove that there is a judgment in this life, and every man his own Judge. But being it doth not onely allow and approve our good actions, but also doth create a complacency, apology, and confidence in us ; being it doth not onely disprove and condemn our evil actions, but doth also constantly accuse us, and breed a fearfull expectation and terrour in us ; and all this prescinding from all relation to any thing either to be enjoyed or suffered in this life : it followeth that this conscience is not so much a judge as a witness, bound over to give testimony, for or against us at some judgment after this life to pass upon us. For all men are a Law unto themselves, and have the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the mean while accusing or excusing one another in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men.

Again,

Again, if we consider the God who made us and hath full dominion over us, whither we look upon him in himself, or in his word, we cannot but expect a judgment from him. First, if we contemplate God in himself, we must acknowledge him to be the judge of all mankind, *so that a man shall say, verily he is a God that judgeth in the earth.* Now the same God who is our Judge, is, by an attribute, necessary and inseparable, Just; and this Justice is so essential to his Godhead, that we may as well deny him to be God, as to be Just. It was a rational expostulation which *Abraham* made, *Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?* we may therefore infallibly conclude that God is a most just Judge; and if he be so, we may as infallibly conclude that after this life he will judge the world in righteousness. For as the affairs of this present world are ordered, though they lie under the disposition of providence, they shew no sign of an universal Justice. The wicked and disobedient persons are often so happy, as if they were rewarded for their impieties; the innocent and religious often so miserable, as if they were punished for their innocence. Nothing more certain then that in this life, rewards are not correspondent to the virtues, punishments not proportionable to the sins of men. Which consideration will enforce one of these conclusions; either that there is no judge of the Actions of mankind, or if there be a judge; he is not just, he renders no proportionable rewards or punishments; or lastly, if there be a Judge, and that Judge be just, then is there a judgment in another world, and the effects thereof concern another life. Being then we must acknowledge that there is a Judge which judgeth the earth, being we cannot deny but God is that Judge, and all must confess that God is most just; being the rewards and punishments of this life are no way answerable to so exact a justice as that which is divine must be; it followeth that there is a judgment yet to come, in which God will shew a perfect demonstration of his justice, and to which every man shall in his own bosom carry an undeniable witness of all his actions.

From hence the Heathen, having always had a serious apprehension both of the power of the conscience of man, and of the exactness of the justice of God, have from thence concluded that there is a Judgment to come. In-
much that when *S. Paul reasoned of righteousness and temperance and judgment to come, Felix trembled.* The discourse of righteousness and temperance touched him who was highly and notoriously guilty of the breach of both, and a pre-conception which he had of judgment after death, now heightened by the Apostles particular description, created an horror in his soul and trembling in his limbs. The same Apostle discoursing to the *Athenians*, the great lights of the Gentile world, and teaching them this Article of our Creed, that God hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead; found some which mocked when they heard of the resurrection of the dead, but against the day of judgment none replied. That was † a principle of their own, that was confessed by all who either be-
lieved themselves, or a God; a conscience, or a Deity.

Acts 24. 25.
Acts 17. 31.
† This principle of a Judgment to come, *Justin Martyr* propounds to the Gentiles

acknowledged by all their Writers, and as the great encouragement of his Apology for the Christian Religion. Ἐπει τοίνυν γεννίως ὁ θεὸς ὁ ἀληθὲς θεοσεβείας ἀρετῆς λόγος, ἥς ἡμεῖς, οἱ μᾶλλον, ἀσεβημάτων τοῖς ἀκινδύους βίβιν ἀπορητοῖς ἐν νενομιστῶν διὰ τῶν μέλλουσιν πῶς τὴν πελάγιον ταύτην βίβιν ἔσται χρίσιν· ὡς ἡ μόνον οἱ ἡμέτεροι καὶ θεὸν κηρύττειν ἀπορητοὶ ἀπορητοὶ τῆς γενομένης, ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ παρ' ὑμῶν νομοῦντες ἐστέ, οἱ κοινὰ μὲν ἀλλὰ καὶ εὐλόγητοι, οἱ τὴν ἀληθὴ καὶ θεῶν ἐπαγγελίαν ἀποδοῦναι παρ' ὑμῶν εὐδοκίαν γινώσκοντες. Ad Graecos Colo. 1. Tertullian shows the same art & force from the writings, but the constant conversation and language even of the Gentiles. Anima licet corporis carcere preffa, licet institutionibus pravis circumscripta, licet libidinis & concupiscentiis evigorata, licet falsis Diis exantillata, cum tamen respiciat uex crapula, uex somno, uex aliqua valetudine, & sanitate suam patitur, & Deum nominat, hoc solo, quia proprie verus hic unus Deus bonus & magnus. Et quod Deus dederit omnium vox est. Judicem quoque testatur illum, Deus videt, & Deo commendo, & Deus mihi reddet. O testimonium animæ naturaliter Christianæ! Apolog. ad Græcos. Indeed the Ancient Gentiles have expressed this judgement to come very exactly. As Posidonius cited by Justin Martyr de Monarch. Dei, Ἐστὶν Δίαινα ὁρθοῦς ὁς πᾶν θ' ὁρεῖ. Εἰ γὰρ ὁ δίδου καὶ τῶν

κατασκευασμένης ἐστὶν ἡ Ἀρχὴ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀρχαίων, καὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων, καὶ τῶν Μαρτύρων, ἐστὶ καὶ ἡ ἀνάστασις. Ἡ γὰρ ποίησις, Θεὸς ὁ πα-
 τὴρ δαμιῶν, οὗ τὸ νόμα ποιεῖται, ἐστὶ ἀνὸς ἀποστόλων ἐστὶν. And Plato especially hath delivered it according to their Notion most
 particularly; whose places to that purpose are faithfully collected by Eusebius and Theodoret, and may be read in them; Eusebius de
 Prep. Ev. lib. 11. cap. 38. & lib. 22. cap. 6. Theodor. Serm. de Fine & Judicio. Where after the citation of severall places he
 concludes, Οὗτος ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων ὁ Πλάτων ἐστὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῷ χριστιανισμῷ.

But yet, beside the consideration of the eterhall power of conscience in our
 selves, beside the intuition of that essential Attribute, the Justice of God
 (which are sufficient arguments to move all men,) we have yet a more near
 and enforcing persuasion grounded upon the expresse determination of the
 will of God. For the determinate counsell of the Almighty actually to judge
 the world in righteousness is clearly revealed in his word. *It is appointed un-*
to men once to die, but after this the Judgment. There is a death appointed to
 follow this life, and a judgment to follow that death, the one as certain as the
 other. For in all ages God hath revealed his resolution to judge the world.

Heb. 9. 27.

Gen. 4. 7.

† So the Targum of Jonathan renders it,

הלא אין

אם תטיב

עובדך

ישתכח לך

חכך ואין

לא תטיב

עבדך

בעלמא

הדן ליום

דינא רבא

חטאך נטיר.

in this world, thy sin is kept unto the day of the great judgment. And the Jerusalem Targum yet more expressly,

הלא אין

חטאך נטיר

אין

אין

אין

אין

אין

אין

אין

אין

אין

אין

אין

אין

אין

אין

אין

אין

אין

אין

אין

אין

אין

אין

אין

אין

אין

אין

אין

אין

אין

אין

אין

אין

אין

אין

אין

אין

אין

אין

אין

אין

אין

אין

אין

אין

אין

אין

Upon the first remarkable action after the fall, there is a sufficient intimati-
 on given unto angry Cain, *If thou doest well shalt thou not be accepted? and if*
thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door; which by the most ancient † interpre-
 tation signifieth a reservation of his sin unto the Judgment of the world to
 come. Before the Floud Enoch prophesied of a judgment to come, *saying,*
Behold the Lord cometh with ten thousand of his Saints to execute judgment upon
all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds
which they have ungodly committed, and of all their hard speeches which ungodly
sinners have spoken against him. His words might have an aim at the waters
 which were to overflow the world; but the ultimate intention looked
 through that fire which shall consume the world preserved from water.

If thou makest thy works good, shall not thy sin be forgiven thee? And if thou makest not thy works good
 in this world, thy sin is kept unto the day of the great judgment. And the Jerusalem Targum yet more expressly,
 הלא אין חטאך נטיר. If thou makest thy works good in this world, shall it not be remitted and forgiven unto
 thee in the world to come? And if thou makest not thy works good in this world, thy sin shall be reserved unto the day of the
 great judgment. In the same manner the Chaldee Paraphrase of Onkelos, ליום דינא רבא חטאך נטיר. c. Jude 4.

The testimonies which follow in the Law and the Prophets, the predictions
 of Christ and the Apostles, are so many and so known, that both the number
 and the plainest will excuse the prosecution. The throne hath been already
 seen, the judge hath appeared sitting on it, the books have been already open-
 ed, the dead small and great have been seen standing before him: there is
 nothing more certain in the word of God, no doctrine more clear and funda-
 mental, then that of eternal Judgment. I shall therefore briefly conclude the
 first consideration from the internal testimony of the conscience of man, from
 the essential attribute, the justice, of God, from the clear and full revelation
 of the will and determination of God, that after death, with a reflection
 on this, and in relation to another life, there is a Judgment to come, there
 shall some person come to judge.

Heb. 6. 2.

Our second consideration followeth; (seeing we are so well assured that
 there shall be a judgment,) who that person is which shall come to judge, who
 shall sit upon that throne, before whose tribunal we shall all appear, from
 whose mouth we may expect our sentence. Now the Judiciary power is the
 power of God, and none hath any right to judge the subjects and servants of
 God, but that God whose servants they are. The law by which we are to
 be judged was given by him, the actions which are to be discussed were due
 to him, the persons which are to be tried are subject to his dominion; God
 therefore is the Judge of all. He shall bring every work into judgment with eve-
 ry secret thing, whether it be good or whether it be evil; and so the last day, that
 day of wrath is the revelation of the righteous judgment of God. Now if God, as
 God,

Heb. 11. 13.

Eccles. 12. 14.

Rom. 12. 5.

God, be the Judge of all, then whosoever is God is judge of all men, and therefore being we have proved the Father and the Son, and shall hereafter also prove the Holy Ghost to be God, it followeth that the † Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost shall judge the world; because the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost in respect of the same divinity have the same autocratorical power, dominion, and authority.

But notwithstanding in that particular day of the general judgment to come, the execution of this Judiciary power shall be particularly committed to the Son, and so the Father and the Holy Ghost shall actually judge the world no otherwise but by him. For God hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world, in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained. It is God who judgeth, it is Christ by whom he judgeth. For the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment to the Son. There is therefore an original, supreme, autocratorical judiciary power; there is a judiciary power delegated, derived, given by commission. Christ as God hath the first together with the Father and the Holy Ghost: Christ as man hath the second from the Father expressly, from the Holy Ghost concomitantly. For the Father hath given him authority to execute judgment, because he is the Son of man; not simply because he is a man, therefore he shall be judge, (for then by the same reason every man should judge, and consequently none, because no man could be judged if every man should only judge) but because of the three persons which are God, he only is † also the Son of man, and therefore for his affinity with their nature, for his sense of their infirmities, for his appearance to their eyes, most fit to represent the greatest mildness and sweetness of equity in the severity of that just and irrelative judgment.

controversie which is raised upon the interpretation of those words of S. John which we ordinarily read thus, 27. Καὶ ἐξουσίαν ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ καὶ κρίσιν ποιῆν ὅτι υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐστίν. 28. Μὴ δαυμάζετε τὸν υἱόν, ὅτι ὁ πατὴρ κρίνει τὸν υἱόν, ὅτι ὁ υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐστίν. By which distinction those words, because he is the Son of man, have reference to the precedent sentence. But anciently they have been otherwise distinguished, Καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ καὶ κρίσιν ποιῆν. ὅτι ὁ υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐστίν, μὴ δαυμάζετε τὸν υἱόν, ὅτι ὁ πατὴρ κρίνει τὸν υἱόν, ὅτι ὁ υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐστίν. So the old Syriack translation, vers. 27. **וְהָיָה כִּי יִשְׁפֹּט הָעָם יְהוָה בְּיָדוֹ וְיִשְׁפֹּט הָעָם בְּיָדוֹ** and then vers. 28. **לֹא תִירָאוּ אֶת הַבָּרִיָּה הַזֶּה כִּי יִשְׁפֹּט הָעָם בְּיָדוֹ** And S. Chrysostom is so earnest for this reading, that he chargeth the former distinction upon Paulus Samosatensis, as intended by him in favour of his Heresy, that Christ was not ing life but purely man. Ὅτι ὁ υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐστίν, μὴ δαυμάζετε τὸν υἱόν. Παῦλος δὲ ὁ Σαμοσατῆν ἐκ τῶν οὐκ οἰσιν, ἀλλὰ πῶς; Ἐξουσίαν ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ κρίσιν ποιῆν ὅτι υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐστίν, ἀλλ' ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ κρίσιν ποιῆν τὸν υἱόν, ὅτι ὁ πατὴρ κρίνει τὸν υἱόν, ὅτι ὁ υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐστίν. ὅτι ὁ υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐστίν, ὅτι ὁ πατὴρ κρίνει τὸν υἱόν, ὅτι ὁ υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐστίν. Οὗτος ἄν ἀναγινώσκων, ὅτι ὁ υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐστίν, μὴ δαυμάζετε τὸν υἱόν. Euthymius followeth the distinction of S. Chrysostom, and Theophylact makes the same Argument, Χρὶς δὲ γινώσκων ὅτι Παῦλος ὁ Σαμοσατῆς ἰδὼν ἀνθρώπον διεμάλιζεν τὸ Κρίνον ὅτι υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐστίν τὸν υἱόν. Καὶ ἐξουσίαν ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ καὶ κρίσιν ποιῆν, ὅτι ὁ υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐστίν. Ἐνταῦθα δὲ εἶπον ἅπ' ἄλλης ἀρχῆς ἀναγινώσκοντες τὸ, Μὴ δαυμάζετε τὸν υἱόν. Ἀνέστη δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα ὅτι τὸ πνεῦμα ἀναγινώσκων, πῶς δὲ κρίσιν τῷ υἱῷ ὁ πατὴρ ἔδωκεν, ὅτι ὁ υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐστίν, ἀλλ' ὅτι Θεός. But though this division of the words be both by S. Chrysostom and Theophylact charged upon Paulus Samosatensis the Heretic, yet we find no other distinction in the ancient Copies; nor did the Ancient Latine Fathers any otherwise read it then that Paulus did. We must then acknowledge no other coherence then the ordinary, that God gave his Son power to judge because he was the Son of man. Nor need we to avoid the Argument of S. Chrysostom, change the ὅτι into καὶ ὅτι, the quia into quatenus, for it is not vendred as the absolute reason in it self, but in relation unto God, or the persons of the Trinity; the Father shall not judge, nor the Holy Ghost, because those two persons are only God, but all judgment is committed to God the Son because he is the Son of man.

Nor was this a reason only in respect of us who are to be judged, but in regard of him also who is to judge; for we must not look only upon his being the Son of man, but also upon what he did and suffered as the Son of man. He humbled himself so far as to take upon him our nature, in that nature so taken he humbled himself to all the infirmities which that was capable of, to all the miseries which this life could bring, to all the pains and sorrows which the sins of all the world could cause; and therefore in regard of his humiliation did God exalt him, and part of the exaltations due unto him was this power of judging. The Father therefore, who is only God, and never took upon him either the nature of men or Angels, judgeth no man; and the same reason reacheth also to the Holy Ghost) but hath

Q q

commit-

John 5. 22, 25, 27.

committed all judgment to the Son; and the reason why he hath committed it to him, is *because he is*, not onely the Son of God, and so truly God, but also the Son of man, and so truly man; *because he is* that Son of man, who suffered so much for the sons of men.

From whence at last it clearly appeareth not onely that it is a certain truth that *Christ* shall judge the world, but also the reasons are declared and manifested unto us why he hath that power committed unto him, why *He shall come to judge the quick and the dead*. For certainly it is a great demonstration of the justice of God so highly to reward that Son of man, as to make him Judge of all the world, who came into the world and was judged here; to give him absolute power of absolution and condemnation, who was by us condemned to die, and died that he might absolve us; to cause all the sons of men to bow before his throne, who did not disdain for their sakes to † stand before the Tribunal and receive that sentence, *let him be crucified*; which event as infallible, and reason as irrefragable, *Christ* himself did shew at the same time when he stood before the judgment-seat, saying, ^a *Nevertheless I say unto you, Hereafter shall ye see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven.*

† Veniet
Christus ut
iudex qui
stetit sub
iudice: ve-
niet in ea
forma in qua
iudicatus est,
ut videant in

quem pupugerunt, & cognoscant Iudæi quem negaverunt, convincat eos homo ille susceptus & ab eis crucifixus, *Author l. de Sym. ad Catech. l. 1. c. 4.* Veniet ergo, fratres mei, veniet ille; qui prius venit occultus, veniet in potestate manifestus. Ille qui iudicatus est veniet iudicaturus. Ille qui stetit ante hominem iudicaturus est omnem hominem, *Idem l. 2. c. 8.* Iudex hic erit filius hominis; forma illa hic iudicabit quæ iudicata est. Audite & intelligite, jam hoc Propheta dixerat, *Videbunt in quem pupugerunt.* Ipsam formam videbunt quam lancea percusserunt. Sedebit Iudex qui stetit sub iudice. Damnabit veros reos qui factus est falsus reus. Ipse veniet, forma illa veniet, *S. Aug. de Verbis Dom. Serm. 64.* ^a *Matt. 26. 64.*

Again, if we look upon our selves which are to be judged, whom can we desire to appear before, rather than him who is of the same nature with us? If the children of *Israel* could not bear the presence of God as a Law-giver, but desired to receive the law by the hand of *Moses*; how should we appear before the presence of that God judging us for the breach of that Law, were it not for a better Mediator, of the same nature that *Moses* was and we are, who is our Judge? In this appeareth the wisdom and goodness of God, that making a general Judgment, he will make a visible Judge, which all may see who shall be judged. *Without holiness no man shall ever see God*, and therefore if God, as onely God, should pronounce sentence upon all men, the ungodly † should never see their Judge. But that both the righteous and unrighteous might see and know who it is that judgeth them, *Christ* who is both God and man is appointed Judge; so as he is man all shall see him, and as he is God they onely shall see him who by that vision shall enjoy him.

† Cum boni
& mali visuri
sunt iudicem
vivorum &
mortuorum,
proculdubio
eum videre
non poterunt
mali, nisi secundum formam qua filius hominis est; sed tamen in claritate in qua iudicabit, non in humilitate in qua iudicatus est. Ceterum illam Dei formam in qua æqualis est Patri proculdubio impii non videbunt. Non enim sunt mundicordes, Beati enim mundicordes, quoniam ipsi videbunt Deum, *S. Aug. de Trin. l. 1. c. 13.* Hoc rectum erat ut iudicandi viderent Iudicem. Iudicandi autem erant boni & mali. Beati enim mundo corde, quoniam ipsi Deum videbunt. Restabat ut in iudicio forma servi & bonis & malis ostenderetur, forma Dei solis bonis servaretur, *Idem de verbis Dom. Serm. 64.* Et potestatem dedit ei iudicium facere quia filius hominis est. Puto nihil esse manifestius. Nam qui Filius Dei est æqualis Patri, non accepit hanc potestatem iudicii faciendi, sed habet illam cum Patre in occulto. Accepit autem illam ut boni & mali eum videant iudicantem, quia filius hominis est. Visio quippe Filii hominis exhibebitur & malis. Nam visio formæ Dei non nisi mundis corde, quia ipsi Deum videbunt, id est, solis piis exhibebitur, quorum dilectioni hoc ipsum promittit quia seipsum ostendit illis, *Idem rursus de Trin. lib. 1. cap. 13.*

Christ Jesus then, the Son of God, and the Son of man, he which was born of the *Virgin Mary*, he which suffered under *Pontius Pilate*, he which was crucified, dead and buried, and descended into hell, he which rose again from the dead, ascended into heaven, and is set down on the right hand of God; He, the same

^a *Matt. 16. 27.*

person, in the same nature, ^a shall come to judge the quick and the dead. For the

Son

Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his Angels, and then he shall reward every man according to his works. He then which is to come is the Son of man, and when he cometh it is to judge. *The same Jesus which was taken up from the Apostles into heaven, shall so come in like manner as they saw him go into heaven.* That Son of man then, which is to judge, is our Jesus, even the same Jesus, and shall come in the same manner, by a true and local translation of the same nature out of heaven. For God will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained, whereof he hath given an assurance unto all men in that he hath raised him from the dead. He then which ascended into heaven, was the same which was raised from the dead, and by that Resurrection God assured us that the same man should us. *For to this end Christ both died and rose and revived that he might be Lord both of the dead and living.* It appeareth therefore by Gods determination, by Christ's Resurrection and Ascension, that the man Christ Jesus is appointed Judge. Acts 10. 41.

This Office and dignity of the Son of man was often declared by several figurative and parabolical descriptions. John the Baptist, representeth him that cometh after him by this delineation of an husbandman, *Whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge his floor, and gather his wheat into the garner, but will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire.* The Son of man describes himself as an householder saying to the reapers in the time of harvest, *Gather ye together first the tares and bind them in bundles to burn them, but gather the wheat into my barn: and this harvest is the end of the world.* He representeth himself under the notion of a Fisherman *casting a net into the sea, and gathering of every kind; which, when it was full, he drew to the shore and sat down and gathered the good into vessels, but cast the bad away.* He is the Bridegroom who took the wife Virgins *with him to the marriage, and shut the door upon the foolish.* He is the man who travelling into a far country, delivered the talents to his servants, and *after a long time cometh again, and reckoneth with them, exalting the good and faithfull, and casting the unprofitable servant into utter darknes.* Lastly, he is the Shepherd, and is so expressely described in relation to this judgment. *For when the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy Angels with him, then shall he sit down upon the throne of his glory. And before him shall be gathered all nations, and he shall separate them one from another, as a Shepherd his sheep from the goats. And he shall set the sheep on his right hand, and the goats on his left.* Being then the Son of man is thus constantly represented as making the great decretory separation, and the last judicatory distinction between man and man, as an husbandman separating the wheat, sometime from the chaff, sometime from the tares: as a Fisherman gathering the good fish, casting the bad away; as a Bridegroom receiving the wife, excluding the foolish Virgins; as a Master distinguishing the servants of his Family, rewarding the faithful, punishing the unprofitable; as a Shepherd, dividing his sheep, from the goats, placing one on the right hand, the other on the left; it plentifully proveth that the same Son of man is appointed the Judge of all the Sons of men. And thus it appeareth that Christ is he who shall be the Judge, which is the second consideration subservient to the present Explication. Matt. 3. 12.
Αρωπια μὲ
τὴν κάλασιν
ἐπὶν, ὑπὸ
δα ὅτι ὁ
χρὶστὸς δεῖκ-
νυσιν, ὅτι τὸ
πρωτεῖον ἐ-
ξουσιον ἐστὶν
τοῦ, S. Chrys.
in loc.
* Matt. 13. 30.
39.
Πάλιν ἀνα-
μνηστικὸν αὐ-
τοῦ ὅτι ἰω-
άννης ἐνείκα-
τον ὅτι χρι-
στὸς αὐτὸν
ἐκπαύσων, S. Chrys. ad
locum.
* Matt. 13. 47.
48.
b Mat. 25. 10.
c Mat. 25. 19,
21, 30.
d Mat. 25. 31.
32, 33.

Thirdly, it being thus resolved that the Son of man shall be the Judge, our next consideration is, what may the nature of this Judgment be; in what that Judicial action doth consist; what he shall then doe; when he shall come to judge. The reality of this Act doth certainly consist in the final determination, and actual disposing of all persons in soul and body to their eternal condition: and in what manner this shall particularly be performed

† S. Austin speaking of the particulars foretold to be exhibited at the day of Judgment, concludes them in this manner, Quæ omnia quidem ventura esse credendum est; sed quibus modis & quo ordine veniant magis tunc docebit rerum experientia quam nunc valet consequi ad perfectum hominem intelligentia, De Civitate Dei, l. 2. c. 30.
 * Matt. 19. 28.
 † Revel. 20.
 4. 11.
 * Rom. 14. 10.
 † 2 Cor. 5. 10.
 * Revel. 20. 12.
 * Matt. 25. 32.
 † Mat. 24. 31.
 † 2 Thess. 2. 1.
 † 1 Cor. 4. 5.
 * Eccl. 12. 14.
 † Revel. 20. 12.
 * Dominus non accepta persona judicat mundum, unusquisque secundum quæ facit accipiet. Si fuerit bonus, bonitas eum antecedit; si nequam, merces nequitie eum sequitur. Epist. Barnab. c. 3.
 * Mat. 24. 34.
 † Ver. 41.
 † Ver. 46.

is not so † certain unto us; but that which is sufficient for us, it is represented under a formal judiciary process. In which first there is described a throne, a tribunal, a judgment-seat; for ^a *in the regeneration the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory*: and that this throne is a seat not onely of Majesty but also of judicature, appeareth by the following words spoken to the Apostles, *ye also shall sit upon the thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel*. As in that vision in the Revelation, ^b *I saw thrones and they sate upon them, and judgment was given unto them*. And *I saw a great white throne, and him that sate on it, from whose face the earth and the heaven fled away*. This throne of Christ is exprelly called his judgment-seat, when the Apostle tells us, ^c *we shall all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ*, and ^d *we must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ*. In respect then of the Son of man, he shall appear in the proper form and condition of a Judge, sitting upon a throne of judicature. Secondly, there is to be a personal appearance of all men before that seat of judicature upon which Christ shall sit, for *we must all appear, and we shall all stand before that judgment-seat*. *I saw the dead*, saith the Apostle, *stand before the throne of God*. Thus all nations shall be gathered before him. He shall send his Angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other. For the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ is our gathering together unto him. Thirdly, when those which are to be judged are brought before the judgment-seat of Christ, all their actions shall appear; he will bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels of the hearts: he will bring every work into judgment with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil. To this end in the vision of Daniel, when the Judgment was set, the books were opened; and in that of S. John, the books were opened, and the dead were judged out of those things that were written in the books according to their works. Fourthly, after the manifestation of all their actions, there followeth a * definitive sentence passed upon all their persons according to those actions which is the fundamental and essential consideration of this judgment; the sentence of absolution, in these words expressed, ^a *Come ye blessed of my Father, inherit the Kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world*; the sentence of condemnation, in this manner, ^b *Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his Angels*. Lastly, after the promulgation of the sentence followeth the execution. As it is written, ^c *And these shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal*. Thus appeareth Christ's majesty by sitting on the throne, his authority by convening all before him, his knowledge and wisdom by opening all secrets, revealing all actions, discerning all inclinations, his justice in condemning sinners, his mercy in absolving believers, his power in the execution of his sentence. And thus the Son of man shall come to judge, which is the last particular subservient to the third Consideration of this Article.

The fourth and last consideration is what is the object of this Action, who are the persons which shall appear before that Judge, and receive their sentence from him, what is the latitude of that expression, *the quick and the dead*. The phrase it self is delivered several times in the Scriptures, and that upon the same occasion; for Christ was ordained of God to be the judge of *quick and dead*; and so his commission extendeth to both: he is ready to judge the *quick and the dead*; his resolution reacheth to each: and as he is ordained and ready, so shall he judge the *quick and the dead*; the execution excludeth neither. But although it be the Scripture language, and therefore certainly true; yet there is some ambiguity in the phrase, and therefore the intended sense not evident.

The

Acts 10. 42.

1 Pet. 4. 5.

2 Tim. 4. 1.

vel exuri sunt : five vivos justos, mortuos autem injustos, quoniam justique quoque judicabuntur, *S. Augst. in Enchirid. c. 54.* Credimus etiam *inde* centurum convenientissimo tempore, & judicaturum vivos & mortuos, five istis nominibus justis & peccatores significantur; five quos tunc ante mortem nostram in terris inventurus est appellari sunt vivi, mortui vero qui in ejus adventu resurrexerunt sunt, *Idem de Fide & Symb. cap. 8.* *Inde* venturus judicare vivos & mortuos. Vivos qui superfuierint, mortuos qui præcesserint. Porro & sic intelligi, vivos, justos; mortuos, injustos: utrosque enim judicat suæ cuique retribuens. Justis dicturus est in judicio, *Venite benedicti, &c.* Sinistris quid? *Ite in ignem, &c.* Sic judicabuntur à Christo vivi & mortui. *Author lib. 1. de Symb. ad Catechum.* Duobus modis hæc sententia accipitur. Vivi & mortui in animo, item vivi & mortui in corpore. In corpore secundum priorem, judicabit vivos in anima credentes, & mortuos in anima fidem nullam habentes: secundum posteriorem judicabit vivos in carne, quos præsentis invenerit ejus adventus; judicabit & mortuos in carne, quos resuscitaturus est Deus excelsus, *Author lib. 4. de Symb. ad Catech. cap. 7.* But although these two Expositions were thus indifferently propounded, yet the former ought by no means so to be received as any way to evacuate or prejudice the later. Quod autem dicimus in Symbolo, in adventu Domini vivos ac mortuos judicandos, non solum justos & peccatores significari, sicut Diodorus putat; sed & vivos eos qui in carne inveniendi sunt credimus, qui adhuc morituri creduntur, vel immutandi sunt, ut alii volunt, ut suscitati continuo, vel reformati, cum ante mortuis judicentur, *Genadius de Dogmat. Eccl. c. 3.* * This is the clear interpretation of Theodoret, without the least mention of any other, Νεκρῶν καὶ ζώντων κριτῶν ἡ Κύριον κἀρχικῶν, ἐπειδὴν καὶ τοὺς νεκροὺς ἀνίστησι καὶ εἰς τὸ κριτεῖον ἀγεί, καὶ τοὺς ζῶντας ἡ ὁ ὁμοιωθεὶς κατὰ τὸν εὐαγγελιστὴν ἐν δυνάμει τοῦ ἀποθανόντος ἀπαύστη τοὺς ζώντας; Πάντες γὰρ, φησὶ, ἐκ κοίτης νεκρῶν, πάντες δὲ ἀλλὰ νεκροὶ, *Com. in 2. Tim. 4. 1.* Vivi agnoscuntur qui in corpore erunt in adventu Domini, mortui qui ex hac luce migraverunt, *Author Ep. Symb. sub nomine S. Chrys.* † This is cleared by the Author of the Questions and Answers under the name of Justin Martyr, Εἰ τὸ ἄναστασις δέσσει πᾶσι τοῖς θάνατον ὁ Θεὸς διδόναι ζωὴν καὶ πάντες ἐκ τῆς τῶν ἀναστάντων τοῦ κριτοῦ παύσεως μέλλουσιν, πᾶς περὶ τῆς ζωῆς καὶ Κύριον; πᾶς δὲ νεκρὸς καὶ θάνατον θνήσκει, ὅν τὰ μὲν σώματα ἐν μνήμασιν ἐρείσται, αἱ δὲ ψυχὴ αὐτῶν (σώματων) καὶ καὶ νεκρῶν εἰσὶν; Resp. Οὐ πάντες, φησὶ, κοίτης νεκρῶν. κείνῃ ἐν ζωῇ μὲν, καὶ τότε ζῶντας, νεκροὺς δὲ, τοὺς ἀνίσταμένους ἐκ τῆς νεκρῶν, *Quest. 109.*

* Omnium enim hominum erit resurrectio. Si omnium erit, ergo omnes moriuntur, ut mors ab Adam ducta omnibus filiis ejus dominetur, & maneat illud privilegium in Domino, Non dabis Sanctum tuum videre corruptionem. Hanc rationem maxima Patrum turba tradente suscepimus, *Genadius de Eccl. Dogmat. cap. 7.*

The onely doubt remaining in this interpretation is, whether those that shall be found alive when our Saviour cometh, shall still so continue till they come to judgment; or upon his first appearance they shall die, and after death revive, and so together with all those which rise out of their graves, appear before the judgment-seat. The consideration of our mortality, and the cause thereof, (that it is appointed for all men once to die, in that death hath passed upon all) might persuade us that the last generation of mankind should taste of death as well as all the rest that went before it; and therefore it hath been thought, especially of late, that those whom *Christ* at his coming finds alive shall immediately die; and after a sudden and universal expiration shall be restored to life again, and joyned with the rest whom the graves shall render, that all may be partakers of the Resurrection.

But the Apostles description of the last day mentioneth no such kind of death, yea rather excludeth it. For we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord, shall not prevent them which are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout with the voice of the Archangel and the trump of God, and the dead in Christ shall rise first; then we which are alive and remain, shall be caught up together with them in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air, and so shall we be ever with the Lord. In which words they which remain unto the coming of the Lord, are not said to die or to rise from the dead, but are distinguished from those which are asleep and rise first; yea being alive are * caught up together with them, having not tasted death.

1 Thess. 4. 15, 16, 17. But the Apostles description of the last day mentioneth no such kind of death, yea rather excludeth it. For we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord, shall not prevent them which are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout with the voice of the Archangel and the trump of God, and the dead in Christ shall rise first; then we which are alive and remain, shall be caught up together with them in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air, and so shall we be ever with the Lord. In which words they which remain unto the coming of the Lord, are not said to die or to rise from the dead, but are distinguished from those which are asleep and rise first; yea being alive are * caught up together with them, having not tasted death.

* This is the observation of Epiphanius, who from these words proves as much. For having repeated the text, he thus infers, 'Απο τῆς ὁμοιωθεὶς κατὰ τὸν εὐαγγελιστὴν ἐν δυνάμει τοῦ ἀποθανόντος ἀπαύστη τοὺς ζώντας; Πάντες γὰρ, φησὶ, ἐκ κοίτης νεκρῶν, πάντες δὲ ἀλλὰ νεκροὶ, *Com. in 2. Tim. 4. 1.* Vivi agnoscuntur qui in corpore erunt in adventu Domini, mortui qui ex hac luce migraverunt, *Author Ep. Symb. sub nomine S. Chrys.* † This is cleared by the Author of the Questions and Answers under the name of Justin Martyr, Εἰ τὸ ἄναστασις δέσσει πᾶσι τοῖς θάνατον ὁ Θεὸς διδόναι ζωὴν καὶ πάντες ἐκ τῆς τῶν ἀναστάντων τοῦ κριτοῦ παύσεως μέλλουσιν, πᾶς περὶ τῆς ζωῆς καὶ Κύριον; πᾶς δὲ νεκρὸς καὶ θάνατον θνήσκει, ὅν τὰ μὲν σώματα ἐν μνήμασιν ἐρείσται, αἱ δὲ ψυχὴ αὐτῶν (σώματων) καὶ καὶ νεκρῶν εἰσὶν; Resp. Οὐ πάντες, φησὶ, κοίτης νεκρῶν. κείνῃ ἐν ζωῇ μὲν, καὶ τότε ζῶντας, νεκροὺς δὲ, τοὺς ἀνίσταμένους ἐκ τῆς νεκρῶν, *Quest. 109.*

1 Cor. 15. 51. The same is farther confirmed by the same Apostle, saying, Behold I shew you a mystery, we shall not all sleep but we shall all be changed. Which being added to the former putteth this doctrine out of question: for the living which remain at the coming of *Christ* are opposed to them which are asleep, and the opposition consists in this, that they shall not sleep; which sleep is not opposed to a long death but to death it self, as it followeth, the dead shall be raised

self hath passed upon the one, and onely a change different from death shall pass upon the other; and so conceive that *Christ* is called the Lord and Judge of the quick and dead, in reference at least to this expression of the Creed. For although it be true of the living of any age to say that *Christ* is Lord and judge of them and of the dead, yet in the next age they are not the living but the dead which *Christ* shall come to judge, and consequently no one generation but the last can be the quick which he shall judge. As therefore to the interpretation of this † Article I take that distinction to be necessary, that in the end of the world all the generations dead shall be revived, and the present generation living so continued, and *Christ* shall gather them all to his tribunal seat, and so shall truly come to judge both *the quick and the dead*.

† This was well observed by S. Aspin, Si autem in illis verbis

Apostoli nul-

lus alius sensus poterit reperiri, & hoc cum intelligi voluisse clarum erit, quod videntur ipsa verba clamare; id est, quod futuri sint in fine seculi, & secundo adventu Domini, qui non expolientur corpore, sed superinduantur immortalitate, ut abfor- beatur mortale à vita: huic sententiae proculdubio conveniet quod in Regula Fidei confitemur, *venturum Dominum, judicaturum vivos & mortuos*, ut non hic intelligamus, vivos justos, mortuos autem injustos, quamvis judicandi sint & justī & injusti, sed vivos, quos nondum exiisse, mortuos autem, quos jam exiisse de corporibus, adventus ejus inveniet, ad 2. *Quaest. Dabiti*. And *Origen* long before did make the same exposition of these words, That he might be Lord both of the dead and living, *Rom. 14. 9.* *Ὁς ἐστιν τῶν ζώντων ὁ ἀποθανόντων Ἰησοῦς, ἵνα νεκρῶν κρείσσων, καὶ ἀνέστη ἵνα μὴ μόνον νεκρῶν ἀλλὰ καὶ ζώντων κρείσσων. Καὶ αἰεὶ ὁ ἀποθανόντων νεκρὸς ἢ ὁ ζώντων κρείσσων ὁ Χριστός, τοῦ ἔσται κατελεγεμῆτος ἐν τῇ σπεί, Κλεινὸς αἰετῆρα (σαλπασί γὰρ καὶ οἱ νεκροὶ ἐκπρόσθεν) ἀναστῆναι ζώσας ὅτι αὐτὸς καὶ τοῦ ἀλλοτρίου, ἑτέρας ὄντας ὅτι ἐκδοσμενίων νεκρῶν. Ἐκεῖ ὅτι καὶ τῶν ἡ λείψις ἔσται. Καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀλλοτρίου ἐξ ἑκαστοῦ τοῦ, οἱ νεκροὶ ἐκδοσμενίων ὡς πῶν. Ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῇ σπεί Θεσσαλονικεῖς αἰετῆρα ἐν ἑτέρας λείψις τῶν αὐτῶν διαφορῶν παρὲς ὅσον, ἄλλος μὲν ἔστι τοῦ κομινοῦ, ἄλλος δὲ τοῦ ζώσας λέγων, &c. l. 2. *contra Celsum*. Which Exposition is far more proper than that of *Methodius*, *Ἐπὶ τῷ πυλῶν καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ κομινοῦ Θεσσαλονικέων, ζώσας μὲν ὅτι πυλῶν, καὶ δὲ ἀθάνατοι, νεκρῶν δὲ ὅτι κομινοῦ*, Phot. in *Biblio. Cod. 224.* and *Rossius*, Quid autem dicitur *judicare vivos & mortuos*, nisi quod alii vivi alii mortui ad judicium veniant? sed animae simul judicabuntur & corpora, in quibus vivos animas, corpora mortuos neminavit, *Expo. in Sym.**

Psal. 73. 2.

To believe an universal Judgment to come is necessary: first, to prevent the dangerous doubts arising against the ruling of the world by the providence of God; that old rock of offence upon which so many souls have suffered shipwrack. That which made the Prophet *David* confess, *his feet were almost gone, his steps had well nigh slipped*, hath hurried multitudes of men to eternal perdition. The conspicuous prosperity of the wicked, and apparent miseries of the righteous, the frequent persecutions of virtue, and eminent rewards of vice, the sweet and quiet departures often attending upon the most dissolute, and horrid tortures putting a period to the most religious lives, have raised a strong temptation of doubt and mistrust whether there be a God that judgeth the earth. Nor is there any thing in this life considered alone, which can give the least rational satisfaction to this temptation. Except there be a life to come after such a death as we daily see, except in that life there be rewards and punishments otherwise dispensed then here they are, how can we ground any acknowledgment of an over-ruling justice? That therefore we may be assured that God who sitteth in heaven ruleth over all the earth; that a divine and most holy providence disposeth and dispense all things here below: it is absolutely necessary to believe and profess, that a just and exact retribution is deferred, that a due and proportionable dispensation of rewards and punishments is reserved to another world, and consequently that there is an Universal Judgment to come.

Secondly, it is necessary to believe a Judgment to come, thereby effectually to provoke our selves to the breaking off our sins by repentance, to the regulating our future actions by the word of God, and to the keeping a conscience void of offence toward God and toward man. Such is the sweetness of our sins, such the connaturalness of our corruptions, so great our confidence of impunity here, that except we looked for an account hereafter, it were unreasonable to expect that any man should forsake his delights, renounce his complacencies, and by a severe repentance create a bitterness to his own Soul. But being once perswaded of a judgment, and with-

withall possessed with a sense of our sins, who will not tremble with *Felix*? who will not flee from the wrath to come? what must the hardness be of that impenitent heart which treasureth up unto it self wrath against the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God? We are naturally inclined to follow the bent of our own wills, and the inclination of our own hearts: all external rules and prescriptions are burthensome to us; and did we not look to give an account, we had no reason to satisfie any other desires then our own: especially the dictates of the word of God are so pressing and exact, that were there nothing but a commanding power, there could be no expectation of obedience. It is necessary then that we should believe that an account must be given of all our actions; and not onely so, but that this account will be exacted according to the rule of God's revealed will, that *God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ, according to the Gospel.* There is in every man not onely a power to reflect, but a necessary reflection upon his actions, not onely a voluntary remembrance, but also an irresistable judgment of his own conversation. Now if there were no other judge beside our own souls, we should be regardless of our own sentence, and wholly unconcerned in our own condemnations. But if we were persuaded that these reflections of conscience are to be so many witnesses before the tribunall of heaven, and that we are to carry in our own hearts a testimony either to absolve or condemn us, we must infallibly watch over that unquiet inmate, and indeavour above all things for a good conscience. For seeing that all things shall be dissolved, what manner of persons ought we to be in all holy conversation and godliness, looking for and hasting unto the coming of the day of God. Reason it self will tell us thus much; but if that do not, or if we will not hearken to our own voice; the grace of God that bringeth salvation teacheth us, that denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world, looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ.

Rom. 2. 5.

Rom. 2. 16.

2 Pet. 3. 11.

Tit. 2. 11, 12, 13.

Thirdly, it is necessary to profess faith in *Christ* as Judge of the quick and the dead, for the strengthening our hope, for the augmenting our comfort, for the establishing our assurance of eternal life. If we look upon the Judgment to come, onely as revealing our secrets, as discerning our actions, as sentencing our persons according to the works done in the flesh, there is not one of us can expect life from that tribunal, or happiness at the last day. We must confess that we have all sinned, and that there is not any sin which we have committed but deserves the sentence of death; we must acknowledge that the best of our actions bear no proportion to eternity, and can challenge no degree of that weight of glory; and therefore in a judgment, as such, there can be nothing but a fearfull expectation of eternal misery, and an absolute despair of everlasting happiness. It is necessary therefore that we should believe that *Christ* shall sit upon the throne, that our Redeemer shall be our Judge, that we shall receive our sentence not according to the rigour of the Law, but the mildness and mercies of the Gospel; and then we may look upon not onely the precepts but also the promises of God; whatsoever sentence in the sacred Scripture speaketh any thing of hope, whatsoever text administred any comfort, whatsoever argument drawn from thence can breed in us any assurance, we may confidently make use of them all in reference to the Judgment to come; because by that Gospel which contains them all we shall be judged. If we consider whose Gospel it is, and who shall judge us by it, we are the members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones; for which cause he is not ashamed to call us brethren. As one of our brethren he hath redeemed us, he hath laid down his life as a ransom for us. He is our High-priest who made an atonement for our sins, a mercifull and faithfull

Ephes. 5. 30.
Heb. 2. 11.
Lev. 25. 48.

Eph. 3. 12.

Job 5. 24.

High-priest in all things, being made like unto his brethren. He which is Judge is also our Advocate; and who shall condemn us, if he shall pass the sentence upon us, who maketh intercession for us? Well therefore may *we have boldness and access with confidence by the faith of him* unto the throne of that Judge, who is our Brother, who is our Redeemer, who is our High-priest, who is our Advocate, who will not by his word at the last day condemn us, because he hath already in the same word absolved us, saying, *Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death unto life.*

Having thus explained the nature of the judgment to come and the necessity of believing the same, we have given sufficient light to every Christian to understand what he ought to intend, and what it is he professeth, when he saith, *I believe in him who shall come to judge the quick and the dead.* For thereby he is conceived to declare thus much. I am fully persuaded of this as of an infallible and necessary truth, that the eternal Son of God, in that humane nature, in which he died, and rose again, and ascended into heaven, shall certainly come from the same heaven into which he ascended, and at his coming shall gather together all those which shall be then alive, and all which ever lived and shall be before that day dead: when causing them all to stand before his judgment-seat he shall judge them all according to their works done in the flesh; and passing the sentence of condemnation upon all the reprobates, shall deliver them to be tormented with the Devil and his Angels, and pronouncing the sentence of absolution upon all the elect, shall translate them into his glorious kingdom of which there shall be no end. And thus I believe in *Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead.*

we are obliged to believe concerning *the Holy Ghost*. And as to this we shall discharge our undertaking, and satisfy whatsoever is required in this Exposition, if we can set forth these two particulars, the Nature and the Office of that blessed Spirit. For the name of GHOST or GAST in the Ancient Saxon language signifieth a Spirit, and in that appellation of the Spirit of God, his nature principally is expressed. The addition of holiness though it denote the intrinsecal sanctity essentially belonging to that Spirit, yet notwithstanding it containeth also a derivative notion, as signifying an emanation of that holiness, and communication of the effects thereof; and in this communication his Office doth consist. Whatsoever therefore doth concern the Spirit of God, as such, and the intrinsecal sanctity which belongeth to that Spirit, may be expressed in the explication of his Nature; whatsoever belongeth to the derivation of that sanctity, may be described in his Office; and consequently more cannot be necessary then to declare what is the Nature, what the Office of the Spirit of God.

For the better indagation of the Nature of the Holy Ghost, I shall proceed by certain steps and degrees, which as they will render the discourse more clear, so will they also make the reasons more strong, and the Arguments more evident. And first, as to the existence of the Spirit of God; it will be unnecessary to endeavour the proof of it; for although the Sadduces seemed to deny it, who said that there is no resurrection, neither angel, nor spirit; though it hath † been ordinarily concluded from thence that they rejected the Holy Ghost, yet it cannot be proved from those words that they denied the existence of the Spirit of God, any more then that they denied the existence of God, who is a Spirit: nor did the Notion which the Jews had of the Spirit of God any way incline the Sadduces, who denied the existence of the Angels and the Souls of men, to reject it. The Resurrection, Angel, and Spirit, which the Sadduces refused to acknowledge, were but to particulars, for it is expressly added that the Pharisees confessed both; of which two, the Resurrection was one, * Angels and Spirits were the other; wherefore that which the Sadduces disbelieved was the existence of such created spiritual natures, as the Angels and the Souls of men are conceived to have. And as for those Disciples at Ephesus, who had † not so much as heard whether there be an Holy Ghost, if they were Gentiles, it is no wonder, because they never had that notion in their Religion; if they were Jews, as they seem to be, because they were baptized with the baptism of John, it signifieth not that they never heard of the Spirit of God, but onely that they had not heard of the giving of it, which the Apostle mentioned. As we read elsewhere, that ^b the Holy Ghost was not yet; not denying the existence, but the plentiful effusion of it. For, whatsoever the Nature of the Spirit of God may be thought to be, no man can conceive the Apostle should deny his existence before Christ's glorification, whose operations was so manifest at his conception. Howsoever, the Apostle asked those ignorant Disciples, *Unto what then were ye baptized?* intimating that if they were baptized according to the rule of Christ, they could not be ignorant that there is an Holy Ghost; because the Apostles were commanded to baptize in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. It is therefore presumed that every one who professeth the name of Christ, from the first baptismal institution acknowledgeth that there is an Holy Ghost; and the only question consists in this, what that Holy Ghost is, in whose name we are baptized, and in whom according to our baptism we profess in the Creed to believe.

In order to the determination of which question; our first Assertion is, that the Holy Ghost, described to us in the Word of God, and joyned with the

Acts 23. 8.

† As Epiph.

Heret. 14.

Πνεῦμα τὸ

ἅγιον Σαδ-

δουχοῖ μὲν ὁ

δὲ τὸ πνε-

ῦμα ἐν ὅμοι-

σιν (ὡς δὲ τὸ

ἄγγελον, ὡς δὲ

ἀνθρώπον) ἐκ

οὗδ' ὁδὸν τῆς

παραλαβῆς

διὰ τὴν μαρτυ-

ρίαν ἐν τῇ

παραλαβῇ δια-

τύτουσιν.

Orat. 37.

* Θεοσώτοι

ῖ, ὁποῖον, ὁ

μολογῶν τὰ

ἀμρότητα καὶ

μὴν, πρὸς

ὅτι πῶς ἐν

ἀγνείᾳ ἀμρό-

τητα ἢ ἐπὶ

πνεύματι καὶ

ἀγγέλοις ἐν

ὅτι; s. Chrys.

ad locum.

† Acts 19. 2.

⁹ Job. 7. 39.

the Father and the Son in the form of Baptism, is a Person. We are all baptized in the name of Three, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; and the publick Confession of our Faith hath relation to those Three. We all confess that two of these, the Father and the Son, are persons; that which we now assert is onely this, that the Holy Ghost, who is of the three the third, is also a Person as the other two. That blessed Spirit is not onely an † enargy or operation, not a quality or power, but a spiritual and intellectual subsistence. * If we conceived it is an operation onely, then must it onely be actuated and not act; and when it is not actuated, it must not be at all. If we say that it is a quality, and not a substance; we say that it is that which we cannot prove to have any being. It seemeth to me strangely unreasonable that men should be so earnest in endeavouring to prove that the Holy Ghost which sanctifieth them is no substance, when they cannot be assured that there is any thing operative in the world beside substantial beings, and consequently if they be not sanctified by that, they can be susceptible of no holiness. By what reason in nature can they be assured, by what revelation in Scripture can they be confident, that there is a reality deserving the name of quality distinguished from all substance, and yet working real and admirable effects? If there were no other Argument but this, that we are assured by the Christian Faith, that there is an Holy Ghost existing; and we cannot be assured, either by reason or faith, that there is a quality really and essentially distinguished from all substance, it would be sufficient to deter us from that boldness to assert the Holy Ghost, in whose name we are baptized, to be nothing else but a quality.

† To conclude the nature of the Holy Ghost, which is not so immediately expressed in the Scriptures, it will be needfull so to place our assertions as that they may occur to all other mis-conceptions. Now the old Notions; (and more they cannot now have,) were thus delivered by Gregory Nazianzene, that great Divine so much concerned in this Subject.

ἡμᾶς Κορὸν οἱ μὲ ἐνεργεῖαν τὸ το πνεῦμα) καὶ ἑλᾶσον, οἱ δὲ κλίσημα, οἱ δὲ Θεὸν, οἱ δὲ ἐκ ἔργου ὁπότερον τούτων, αἰδοῖ ὁ
 γραφῆς, ὡς φασι, ἡ δὲ τρεῖς (αφᾶς δηλωσάντες, Orat. 37. These were the three particular and opposite Opinions, either the Spirit is
 an operation, or a created substance, or God; the fourth is but a doubt or hesitation which of the three is true. The first of these is thus
 propounded by way of question, Τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἢ ἴσ' ἡμᾶς ἐαυτὸ ὑπεσπύκτων πάσιως ὑποδύλον, ἢ ἴσ' ἐν ἑτέρῳ διαμεχόμενον,
 ὅν τὸ μὲ ὅσταν καὶ ὅσταν οἱ ἀπὸ πάντων θεωρεῖ, τὸ δὲ Συμβεβηκός. Either it is subsisting in it self, as a substance, or in another, as an ac-
 cident. This was the first question then, and still is. * This is the Argument of the same Father, Εἰ μὲ ἐν Συμβεβηκῶν,
 ἐνεργεῖαν τὸ τοῦ ἁγίου Θεοῦ ἢ τὸ ἐν ἑτέρῳ, ἢ τὸ ἐν τῷ Θεῷ; τὸ το γὰρ πως μᾶλλον καὶ φέρει Συμβεβηκῶν, καὶ οἱ ἐνεργεῖαν, ἐνεργησάντων ὁ
 λογισμὸς ἐκ ἐνεργήσεως, καὶ ὁ μὲ τὸ ἐνεργησάντων παύσει. τοῦτον γὰρ ἡ ἐνεργεῖαν. Πῶς ἐν ἐνεργεῖαν, καὶ τὰς λέγει, καὶ ἀποκρίνεται, καὶ
 λυπεῖται, καὶ παρ᾽ ἑωυτοῦ, καὶ ὅσα κινῶνται σαφῶς ὅτιν ἡ κινήσεως.

But we are not left to guess at the nature of the Spirit of God; the word of God which came from that Spirit hath sufficiently delivered him as a person. It is indeed to be observed that in the Scriptures there are some things spoken of the Holy Ghost which are proper and peculiar to a Person, as the Adversaries confess: others, which are not properly and primarily to be attributed to a Person, as we cannot deny: and it might seem to be equally doubtfull, in relation to the Scripture-expressions, whether the Holy Ghost were a person or no; and that they which deny his Personality may pretend as much Scripture as they which assert it. But in this seeming indifference we must also observe a large diversity; inasmuch as the Holy Ghost, or Spirit of God, is not always taken in the same propriety of signification; nor do we say that the Holy Ghost which signifieth a Person, always signifieth so much. It is therefore easily conceived, how some things may be attributed to the Spirit in the Scriptures which are not proper to a Person, and yet the Spirit be a Person, because sometimes the Spirit is taken for that which is not a Person, as we acknowledge. Whereas, if ever any thing be attributed to the Holy Ghost, as to a Person, which cannot be otherwise understood of the Spirit of God then as of a Person, then may we infallibly conclude that the Holy Ghost is a Person. This therefore we shall endeavour fully and clearly to demonstrate; first, that the Scriptures declare unto us the Holy Ghost as a Person, by such attributes and expressions as cannot be understood to be

spoken of the Spirit of God any other way then as of a Person: secondly, that whatsoever attributes or expressions are used in the Scriptures of the Holy Ghost, and are objected as repugnant to the nature of a Person, either are not so repugnant, as is objected, or, if they be, they belong unto the Spirit as it signifies not a Person.

First then the Holy Ghost, or good Spirit of God is clearly and formally opposed to those evil Spirits, which are and must be acknowledged persons, of a spiritual and intellectual subsistence. As, *the Spirit of the Lord departed from Saul, and an evil Spirit from the Lord troubled him.* Now, what those evil spirits from the Lord were, is apparent from the sad example of *Ahab*, concerning whom we read, *there came out a Spirit and stood before the Lord and said, I will entice him: and the Lord said unto him; wherewith? and he said, I will go out and be a lying Spirit in the mouth of all his Prophets, and the Lord said, Thou shalt entice him, and thou shalt also prevail; and go out and doe even so.* From whence it is evident that the evil Spirits from God were certain persons, even bad Angels, to which the one good Spirit as a person is opposed, departing from him to whom the other cometh.

Again, the New Testament doth describe the Holy Ghost by such personal dispositions, and with such operations, as are as evident marks and signs of a person as any which are attributed to the Father or the Son, which are unquestionable persons, and whatsoever terms are spoken of the Spirit by way of quality, are spoken as well of those which are acknowledged persons. We are exhorted by the Apostle *not to grieve the Spirit of God*, and grief is certainly a personal affection of which a quality is not capable. We are assured that the same *Spirit maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered*; and we can understand what are interceding persons, but have no apprehension of interceding or groaning qualities. The operations of the Spirit are manifest, and as manifestly personal: for he *searcheth all things, yea even the deep things of God*, and so he knoweth all things, *even the things of God*, which can be no description of the power of God; he *worketh all the spiritual gifts dividing to every man severally as he will*; in which the operation, discretion, distribution, and all these voluntary, are sufficient demonstrations of a person. He revealeth the will of God and speaketh to the sons of men, in the nature and after the manner of a person; for the Spirit said unto Peter, *Behold three men seek thee. Arise therefore and get thee down, and go with them doubting nothing, for I have sent them*: and the Holy Ghost said unto the Prophets and Teachers at *Antioch*, *Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them.* We cannot better understand the Nature of the Holy Ghost then by the description given by *Christ* which sent him: and he said thus to his Disciples, *The Comforter (or, the Advocate) which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, he shall testify of me: and ye also shall bear witness. If I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you, but if I depart I will send him unto you. And when he is come he will reprove the world, and he will guide you into all truth; for he shall not speak of himself, but whatsoever he shall hear that shall he speak, and he shall shew you things to come; he shall glorify me, for he shall receive of mine, and shall shew it unto you.* All which words are nothing else but so many descriptions of a person, a person hearing, a person receiving, a person testifying, a person speaking, a person reproving, a person instructing.

† The present Adversaries to this truth

The † Adversaries to this truth acknowledging all these personal expressions are the Socinians, and their opinion was thus first delivered by Socinus, Quod in testimoniis sacris quæ adversarij citant Spiritui S. actiones tribuuntur, & ea quæ personarum sunt propria, ex hæc nihil concludi potest, cum aliis rebus quas personas non esse constat,

star, similiter in Scripturis sacris actiones tribuantur, & ea quæ sunt propria personarum. Cujus rei plenissimam fidem facere potest vel locus ille Pauli 1 Cor. 13. 2 v. 4. ad 8. ubi perpetuo de Charitate, tanquam de persona aliqua loquitur, illi permulta tribuens, quæ revera non nisi in personam cadunt, *Falsus Socinus contra Wickham*, c. 10.

ons, answer that it is ordinary in the Scriptures to find the like expressions, which are proper unto persons, given unto those things which are no persons: as when the Apostle saith *Charity suffereth long and is kind, charity envieth not, charity wanteth not it self, is not puffed up, doth not behave it self unseemly, seeketh not her own, is not easily provoked, thinketh none evil, rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth, beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things.* All which personal actions are attributed to Charity which is no person, as in * other cases it is usual, but belonging to that person which is charitable; because that person which is so qualified doth perform those actions according to, and by virtue of, that charity which is in him. In the same manner, . . say they, personal actions are attributed to the Holy Ghost, which is no person, but only the virtue, power, and efficacy of God the Father of our Lord *Jesus Christ*; because that God the Father is a person and doth perform those personal actions, attributed to the Holy Ghost, by that virtue, power, and efficacy in himself which is the Holy Ghost. As when we read *the Spirit said unto Peter, a Behold three men seek thee; arise therefore and get thee down and go with them doubting nothing; for I have sent them*: we must understand that God the Father was the person which spake those words, and which sent those men; but because he did so by that virtue which is the Holy Ghost, therefore the Holy Ghost is said to speak those words and send those men. In the same manner when we read, *the Holy Ghost said unto those at Antioch, b Separate me Barnabas and Saul, for the work whereunto I have called them*, we must conceive it was God the Father who spake those words, who had called *Barnabas* and *Saul*, and to whom they were to be separated; but because God did all this by that power within him which is his Spirit, therefore those words and actions are attributed to the Holy Ghost. This is the summ of their answer; and more then this I conceive cannot be said in answer to that Argument which we urge from those personal expressions attributed to the Spirit of God, and, as we believe, as to a person.

occiderit, Rom. 7. 11. & legi, quod loquatur, Rom. 3. 19. & Scripturæ quod prospiciat & prænnunciet, Gal. 3. 18. & Charitati quod sit longanimis, &c. 1 Cor. 13. 4, 5, 6, 7. Denique Spiritui, i. e. vento, quod spiret ubi velit, cap. 6. Vide Socini Epistolam 3. ad Petrum Scatorium. . . . Quod si quis dixerit satis constare Paulum eo in loco figurate loqui, & charitatis nomine eum intelligere qui charitate est præditus quatenus ea est præditus: respondebo, Cum Spiritus S. sit Spiritus Dei, certumque sit alioqui spiritum alicujus personæ non posse esse personam ab ea cujus est Spiritus distinctam, non minus constare cum Spiritui S. ea tribuantur, quæ personæ & simul ipsius Dei sunt propria, nihil aliud intelligendum nomine Spiritus S. esse, quam ipsum Deum spiritui suo, id est, virtute atque efficacia sua agentem atque operantem. F. Socinus ibid. Quoniam vero Spiritus S. virtus Dei est, hinc fit ut ea quæ Dei sunt, Spiritui S. attribuantur, & sub nomine Spiritus S. sæpe Deus ipse intelligatur, quatenus suam virtutem Deus per Spiritum suum exerit, Catech. Rarov. ibid. ^a Actis 10. 20. ^b Actis 13. 2.

But this Answer is most apparently insufficient, as giving no satisfaction to the Argument. For if all the personal actions, attributed in the Scriptures to the Spirit, might proceed from the Person of God the Father, according to the power which is in him, then might this answer seem satisfactory, but if these actions be personal, as they are acknowledged and cannot be denied, if the same cannot be attributed to the Person of God the Father, whose Spirit it is, if he cannot be said to do that, by the power within him, which is said to be done by the Holy Ghost, then is that defence not to be defended; then must the Holy Ghost be acknowledged a person. But I shall clearly prove, that there are several personal attributes given in the sacred Scriptures expressly to the Holy Ghost, which cannot be ascribed to God the Father, which God the Father by that power which is in him, cannot be said to do; and

and consequently cannot be any ground why those attributes should be given to the Spirit if it be not a person.

To make intercession is a personal action, and this action is attributed to the Spirit of God, *because he maketh intercession for the Saints according to the will of God.* But to make intercession, is not an act which can be attributed to God the Father, neither can he be said to intercede for us according to that power which is in him; and therefore this can be no Prosopopeia, the Holy Ghost cannot be said to exercise the personal action of intercession for that reason because it is the Spirit of that person which intercedeth for us. To come unto men, as being sent unto them, is a personall action, and so the Comforter, or Advocate, who is the Holy Ghost, did come being sent; *when the Comforter is come whom I will send you from the Father,* saith Christ, and again, *If I goe not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him to you.* But to come unto men as being sent, cannot be ascribed to God the Father, who sendeth, but is never sent; especially in this particular, in which the Father is said expressly to send, and that in the name of the Son (*whom the Father will send in my name,* saith our Saviour.) When therefore the Holy Ghost cometh to the Sons of men, as sent by the Father in the name of the Son, and sent by the Son himself, this personal action cannot be attributed to the Father as working by the power within him, and consequently cannot ground a Prosopopeia, by which the virtue or power of God the Father shall be said to doe it. To speak and hear are personal actions, and both together attributed to the Spirit, in such a manner as they cannot be ascribed to God the Father. *When he,* saith Christ, *the Spirit of truth is come, he will guide you into all truth; for he shall not speak of himself: but whatsoever he shall hear, that he shall speak.* Now to speak and not of himself cannot be attributed to God the Father, who doth all things of himself; to speak what he heareth, and that of the Son; to deliver what he receiveth from another, and to glorifie him from whom he receiveth by receiving from him, as Christ speaketh of the Holy Ghost, *He shall glorifie me, for he shall receive of mine, and shew it to you,* is by no means applicable to the Father; and consequently it cannot be true that the Holy Ghost is therefore said to doe these personal actions, because that person, whose Spirit the Holy Ghost is, doth those actions by and according to his own power, which is the Holy Ghost. It remaineth therefore that the Answer given by the Adversaries of this truth is apparently insufficient, and consequently that our Argument, drawn from the personal actions attributed in the Scriptures to the Spirit, is sound and valid.

I thought this discourse had fully destroyed the Socinian Prosopopeia; and indeed as they ordinarily propound their Answer, it is abundantly refuted. But I find the subtilty of *Socinus* prepared * another explication of the Prosopopeia to supply the room where he foresaw the former would not serve. Which double Figure he groundeth upon this distinction. The Spirit, that is, the power of God, saith he, may be considered either as a propriety and power in God, or as the things on which it worketh are affected with it. If it be considered in the first notion, then if any Personal attribute be given to the Spirit, the Spirit is there taken for God, and by the Spirit God is signified: if it be considered in the second notion, then if any Personal attribute be given to the Spirit, the Spirit is taken for that man in which it worketh, and that man, affected with it, is called the Spirit of God.

* Credo me satis ostendisse, Spiritum S. non esse personam, non magis quam alia vel proprietates, vel effecta Dei sint personæ, cum nihil sit aliud quam peculiaris quædam virtus & efficiacia Dei;

quæ sit ipsius Dei proprietas, & vis per quam agit consideratur & accipitur, figuræ metonymiæ aut prosopopœiæ accommodatissimus est locus: & metonymiæ quidem, si Spiritus S. nomine ipse Deus cujus est Spiritus, quique per eum agit significetur; prosopopœiæ vero, ut quando Deus per Spiritum S. agit ipsi Spiritui S. Dei actio tribuatur: sin autem hæc virtus & efficiacia

efficacia Dei consideratur & accipitur, ut res in quibus agit, ab ipsa efficiuntur, utrique isti figura similiter aptissimus est locus quandoquidem commodissime per metonymiam is qui à Spiritu S. aliquo modo affectus quidpiam agit, quatenus id agit Spiritus Sanctus seu Spiritus Dei metonymicè dici potest: ut factum est apud Paulum, cum ait (1 Cor. 2. 10.) Spiritum (sub. Dei) omnia scrutari etiam profunda Dei: ubi Spiritus Dei nomine sine dubio intellexit hominem Spiritu Dei præditum, quatenus viz. ab isto Spiritu afficitur. Jam per prosopopeiam ipsi Spiritui S. actionem tribui, quæ ipsius Spiritus ope ab homine fiat adeo est proclive ut nihil magis, F. Socinus, in Resp. ad iudeum cap. 10.

So that now we must not onely shew that such things which are attributed to the Holy Ghost cannot be spoken of the Father, but we must also prove that they cannot be attributed unto man, in whom the Spirit worketh from the Father. And this also will be very easily and evidently proved. The Holy Ghost is said to come unto the Apostles as sent by the Father and the Son, and to come as so sent is a personal action, which we have already shewed cannot be the action of the Father, who sent the Spirit; and it is as certain that it cannot be the action of an Apostle who was affected with the Spirit which was sent, except we can say that the Father and the Son did send S. Peter an Advocate to S. Peter: and S. Peter, being sent by the Father and the Son did come unto S. Peter. Again, our Saviour speaking of the Holy Ghost, saith, *He shall receive of mine*: therefore the Holy Ghost in that place is not taken for the Father; and *shew it unto you*, therefore he is not taken for an Apostle: in that he *receiveth* the first Socinian Prosopopeia is improper; in that he *sheweth* to the Apostle, the second is absurd. The Holy Ghost then is described as a Person distinct from the Person of the Father, whose power he is, and distinct from the Person of the Apostle in whom he worketh, and consequently neither of the Socinian Figures can evacuate or enervate the Doctrine of his proper and peculiar Personality.

Secondly for those Attributes or expressions used of the Holy Ghost in the sacred Scriptures, and pretended to be repugnant to the nature of a Person, either they are not so repugnant, or if they be, they belong unto the Spirit, as it signifieth not the Person but the gifts or effects of the Spirit. † They tell us that the Spirit is given, and that, sometimes in measure, sometimes without measure, that the Spirit is powred out, and that men do drink of it, and are filled with it, that it is doubled and distributed, and something is taken from it, and that sometimes it is extinguished: and from hence they gather that the Holy Ghost is not a Person, because these expressions are inconsistent with personality. But a satisfactory Answer is easily returned to this objection. 'Tis true, that God is said to have *given the Holy Ghost to them that obey him*, but it is as true that a Person may be given; so we read in the Prophet *Isaiah*, *unto us a Son is given*, and we are assured that *God so loved the world that he gave his onely begotten Son*, and certainly the Son of God is a Person. And if all the rest of the expressions be such as they pretend, that is, not proper to a person, yet do they no way prejudice the truth of our Assertion, because we acknowledge the effects and operations of the Spirit to have in the Scriptures the name of the Spirit, who is the cause of those operations. And being to that Spirit, as the cause, we have already shewn those attributes to be given which can agree to nothing but a Person; we therefore conclude against the Socinians and the † Jews, that the Holy Ghost is not a quality, but a Person; which is our first Assertion.

centur homines, quod augeatur, quod in duplo detur, in partes distribuatur, tollatur ipse, & ex ipso tollatur; & similia in Scripturis extant. Catech. Racov. c. 6. Quest. 12. Aët. 5. 32. 1 Jo. 9. 6. † The Opinion of the Jews was, that the Holy Ghost was nothing else but the effluus or energy of God; and therefore they which denied the substantiality of the Spirit were looked upon as symbolizing with the Jews in this particular. Lactantius in libris suis, & maxime in Epistolis ad Demetrianum Spiritus S. omnino negat substantiam; & errore Iudaico dicit eum vel ad Patrem referri, vel ad Filium, & sanctificationem utriusque Personæ sub ejus nomine demonstrari, S. Hieron. Epist. 55. Moses Maimonides sufficiently declareth the opinion of the Jews, who delivering the several significations of *רוח*, maketh the fifth and sixth to be these. Quinto significat Influentiam illam intellectualem divinam à Deo Prophetis instillatam, cujus virtute prophetant. Sexto significat Propositum; & Voluntatem. And thea conclusions. Vox hæc *רוח* quando Deo attribuitur, ubique sumitur partim in quinta, partim in sexta significatione, quatenus voluntatem significat, More Nechohim, p. 1. c. 4.

† Spiritum S. non esse Deitatis Personam hinc discere potes, primum, quod ea quæ Spiritui S. in Scripturis attribuantur, nulla prorsus ratione Personæ conveniant, ut sunt quod detur quod ex eo detur, idque aut secundum mensuram, aut absque omni mensura quod effundatur ipse & ex ipso effundatur, & quod eo pot-

I COR. 2. 11.

* The Socinians endeavouring to prove from this place that the Holy Ghost is not a person, lay the foundation of their Argument in this, that he is the Spirit of God, and by nature in God, so that those things which are proper to the divine nature are

attributed and belong to him, and because there is another person in the divine essence, and, as they say, there can be but one, therefore the Holy Ghost is not a Person. Deinde idem (sc. Sp. S. non esse personam) ex eo pater, quod non sit extra Deum natura sed in ipso Deo. Nisi enim natura Deo inesset, non potuisset Paulus Spiritum Dei cum spiritu hominis qui homini inest natura conferre, idque eo in loco, I COR. 2. 11. ubi ait, Quis hominum novit quae sunt hominis nisi spiritus hominis qui inest homine? ita quae sunt Dei nemo novit nisi Spiritus Dei. Quoniam vero Spiritus S. in Deo est, nec tamen in Spiritu S. reciproce dici potest esse Deum, hinc apparet Sp. S. non esse Personam. Praeterea cum superius demonstratum sit unam tantum esse in Deitate personam, & Spiritus S. sit Dei virtus, ut verba Christi ad Apostolos indicant, Luc. 24. 49. efficitur Spiritum S. non esse personam divinam. Denique si Spiritus S. esset persona, essentiam quoque divinam eum habere oporteret. Nam ea attribuntur illi quae propria sunt essentiae divinae: ac superius docuimus substantiam divinam unam esse numero, nec tribus personis esse posse communem. Quamobrem Sp. non esse Deitatis personam planum est, catech. Racov. c. 6. To the same purpose doth Socinus argue against Wickus, that the nature of the Spirit is the nature of God, and that the Spirit cannot therefore be a person, because there can be but one person in the nature of God. whereas therefore independently from this place we have proved that the Holy Spirit is a person, and from this place have inferred with them, that the same spirit is in God and of the divine nature, it followeth that he is no created Spirit, inasmuch as nothing in the divine nature can be created.

Secondly, the Holy Ghost is such a one, as against whom a sin may be committed, and when it is so, cannot be remitted. But if he were no Person, we could not commit that sin against him; and if he were a created Person, the sin committed against him could not be irremissible. Therefore he is a Person, and that uncreated. The Argument is grounded upon the words of our Saviour, * All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men, but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men. And whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man it shall be forgiven him; but whosoever speaketh a word against the Holy Ghost it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world neither in the world to come. By which words it appeareth there is a sin or blasphemy against the Holy Ghost distinct from all other sins and blasphemies committed against God the Father or the Son of God; that this sin hath an aggravation added unto it beyond other sins and blasphemies: but if the Holy Spirit were no person, the sin could not be distinct from those sins which are committed against him whose Spirit he is; and if he were a person created, the sin could receive no such aggravation beyond other sins and blasphemies.

* Matt. 12. 31, 32. Quomodo audent inter omnia numerare Spiritum S. quando ipse Dominus dixerit, Qui blasphemaverit in Filium hominis remittetur ei, qui autem blasphemaverit in Spiritum S. nec hic nec in futurum remittetur ei. Quomodo igitur inter creaturas audeat quisquam Spiritum computare? Aut quis sic se obligat, ut si creaturae derogaverit, non putet sibi hoc aliqua venia relaxandum? q. s. Ambrose de Spiritu S. lib. 1. cap. 3.

To

Of our Adversaries it cannot signifie Christ. For that Lord of whom Moses spake, was then when Moses wrote; but that Christ of which they interpret it, was not then, as they teach, therefore that Lord cannot be Christ, in their interpretation without a contradiction. † For though Christ be most frequently called our Lord, yet being God the Father of Christ is our Lord, being $\kappa\upsilon\epsilon\iota\sigma$ is often by S. Paul without any restriction or intimation of appropriating that $\alpha\lambda\lambda\omega$ unto the Son, which is attributed to the Lord by him, the rule cannot be certain and universal. For I desire to know by what means they can be assured, that the Apostle doth by the title $\kappa\upsilon\epsilon\iota\sigma$ intend Christ and not the most High God the Father, in these following places, 1 Cor. 3. 5. 4. 19. 7. 10. 12. 16. 7. 1 Thess. 4. 6. 5. 27. 2 Thess. 3. 1, 5, 16. 2 Tim. 1. 16, 18. 2. 7. And beside I ask, how the pretence of this general rule can be properly objected by those who knew that they to whom they do object this Rule, have contended that this title is likewise attributed to the holy Ghost. As S. Basil upon that place, 2 Thess. 3. 5. $\text{Ὁ } \kappa\upsilon\epsilon\iota\sigma \text{ } \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\beta\alpha\lambda\epsilon\nu \text{ } \psi\alpha\lambda\mu\acute{o}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma \text{ } \tau\eta\varsigma \text{ } \kappa\alpha\rho\delta\iota\alpha\varsigma \text{ } \epsilon\iota\varsigma \text{ } \tau\omega\text{ν} \text{ } \alpha\rho\alpha\gamma\eta\lambda\omega\text{ν} \text{ } \tau\eta\varsigma \text{ } \Theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon, \text{ } \kappa\upsilon \text{ } \epsilon\iota\varsigma \text{ } \tau\omega\text{ν} \text{ } \psi\alpha\sigma\mu\eta\text{ν}\omega\text{ν} \text{ } \chi\epsilon\iota\rho\epsilon\varsigma$, thus disputes, $\text{Τίς } \delta\text{ } \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\beta\alpha\lambda\omega\text{ν} \text{ } \kappa\upsilon\epsilon\iota\sigma \text{ } \epsilon\iota\varsigma \text{ } \tau\omega\text{ν} \text{ } \Theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon \text{ } \alpha\rho\alpha\gamma\eta\lambda\omega\text{ν}, \text{ } \kappa\upsilon \text{ } \epsilon\iota\varsigma \text{ } \tau\omega\text{ν} \text{ } \psi\alpha\sigma\mu\eta\text{ν}\omega\text{ν} \text{ } \chi\epsilon\iota\rho\epsilon\varsigma \text{ } \psi\alpha\sigma\mu\eta\text{ν}\omega\text{ν}; \text{ } \psi\alpha\sigma\mu\eta\text{ν}\omega\text{ν} \text{ } \eta\mu\acute{\iota}\nu \text{ } \epsilon\iota \text{ } \tau\omega \text{ } \Pi\alpha\tau\epsilon\rho\iota \text{ } \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\beta\alpha\lambda\epsilon\mu\epsilon\text{ν}\omega\text{ν}. \text{ } \text{Εἰτε } \tau\eta\text{ } \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha \text{ } \tau\eta\text{ } \Pi\alpha\tau\epsilon\rho\acute{\epsilon}\alpha \text{ } \delta\lambda\omicron\gamma\text{ } \Theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon, \text{ } \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\omega\varsigma \text{ } \alpha\upsilon \text{ } \epsilon\pi\epsilon\tau\eta\text{ν}, \text{ } \kappa\upsilon \text{ } \kappa\upsilon\epsilon\iota\sigma \text{ } \eta\mu\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \text{ } \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\beta\alpha\lambda\omega\text{ν} \text{ } \epsilon\iota\varsigma \text{ } \tau\omega\text{ν} \text{ } \psi\alpha\sigma\mu\eta\text{ν}\omega\text{ν}. \text{ } \text{Εἴτε } \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha \text{ } \tau\eta\text{ } \Theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon, \text{ } \sigma\epsilon\pi\epsilon\kappa\iota\sigma\iota\sigma\iota\omega\text{ν}, \text{ } \epsilon\iota\varsigma \text{ } \tau\omega\text{ν} \text{ } \psi\alpha\sigma\mu\eta\text{ν}\omega\text{ν} \text{ } \psi\alpha\sigma\mu\eta\text{ν}\omega\text{ν}. \text{ } \text{Ζ\eta\tau\epsilon\iota}\tau\epsilon\text{ } \sigma\alpha\text{ν} \text{ } \eta\text{ν} \text{ } \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu \text{ } \alpha\lambda\lambda\omicron \text{ } \sigma\epsilon\pi\epsilon\kappa\iota\sigma\iota\omega\text{ν} \text{ } \delta\text{ } \tau\eta\text{ } \psi\alpha\sigma\mu\eta\text{ν}\omega\text{ν} \text{ } \kappa\upsilon\epsilon\iota\sigma \text{ } \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\beta\alpha\lambda\epsilon\mu\epsilon\text{ν}\omega\text{ν} \text{ } \alpha\lambda\lambda\omicron\text{ν}. \text{ } \text{And upon the like place, 1 Thess. 3. 12, 13. } \text{Π\acute{o}\tau\epsilon\text{ν} } \kappa\upsilon\epsilon\iota\sigma\text{ } \epsilon\upsilon\chi\epsilon\text{ } \xi\upsilon\text{ } \mu\epsilon\text{ } \sigma\epsilon\text{ } \sigma\epsilon\text{ } \tau\eta\text{ } \Pi\alpha\tau\epsilon\rho\acute{\epsilon}\alpha \text{ } \eta\mu\acute{\iota}\ν \text{ } \tau\eta\text{ } \pi\alpha\rho\omicron\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\text{ } \tau\eta\text{ } \kappa\upsilon\epsilon\iota\sigma \text{ } \eta\mu\acute{\iota}\ν, \text{ } \alpha\mu\acute{\iota}\mu\eta\tau\omega\varsigma \text{ } \tau\eta\text{ } \kappa\alpha\rho\delta\iota\alpha\text{ } \epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\eta\gamma\text{ } \eta\mu\acute{\iota}\ν \text{ } \epsilon\iota\varsigma \text{ } \alpha\rho\alpha\gamma\iota\sigma\mu\acute{\omega}\nu \text{ } \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha \text{ } \tau\eta\text{ } \Theta\epsilon\omega\text{ν}\omicron\lambda\omicron\gamma\iota\kappa\eta \text{ } \pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\omega\text{ν} \text{ } \chi\eta\epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma, \text{ } \text{Ἀπορ\acute{\alpha}\gamma\iota\sigma\mu\omega\text{ν} } \eta\mu\acute{\iota}\ν \text{ } \epsilon\iota \text{ } \mu\eta \text{ } \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha \text{ } \tau\eta\text{ } \lambda\eta\iota\tau\epsilon\rho\eta\kappa\iota\sigma\tau\eta\text{ν} \text{ } \pi\alpha\rho\omicron\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\text{ν} \text{ } \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha \text{ } \tau\eta\text{ } \sigma\epsilon\omega\varsigma \text{ } \delta\iota\alpha\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\iota\alpha \text{ } \psi\alpha\pi\epsilon\iota\lambda\omicron\mu\epsilon\text{ν}\omega\text{ν} \text{ } (\text{the actively revived opinion clearly}) \text{ } \tau\omega \text{ } \Pi\alpha\tau\epsilon\rho\iota \text{ } \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma \text{ } \alpha\lambda\lambda\text{ } \epsilon\kappa \text{ } \xi\chi\upsilon\sigma\iota, \text{ } De Spiritu Sancto, cap. 21.$

Again, the same Scriptures do clearly manifest the same Spirit to be God, and term him plainly and expressly so. For when *Peter* said, *Ananias, Why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to the Holy Ghost?* he repeateth the same question in reference to the same offence, *Why hast thou conceived this thing in thine heart? thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God.* To lie unto the Holy Ghost, is to lie unto God: to lie unto the Holy Ghost, is not to lie unto men, because the Holy Ghost is not man, and consequently not to lie unto any Angel, because the Holy Ghost is not an Angel, not to lie unto any creature, because the Holy Ghost is no creature, but to lie unto God, because the Holy Ghost is God.

To this plain and evident Argument there are so many Answers, that the very multitude discovers the weakness of them all : for if any one of them were sufficient to bear down the force of our reason, the rest would be superfluous. First, they answer that it cannot be collected from hence that the Spirit is God, because the *Holy Ghost* in the Original is † put in one case, and *God* in another, and the Apostle speaking in one manner of the Spirit, and in another of God, cannot shew that the Spirit is God. To which is easily answered, that the case or manner of the Apostles speech can make no difference, if the sense and substance be the same, as here it is ; for to deceive the Holy Ghost is nothing else but to lie unto him, or by a lie to endeavour to deceive him. The Act objected to *Ananias* was but one, which act of his the Apostles looked upon as injurious not to themselves but to the Holy Ghost ; and therefore *S. Peter* shewed the sin to be not against men, but against God ; as certainly then as the Apostles were men, so certainly was the Holy Ghost, in the esteem of *S. Peter*, God.

As for that sense which they put upon the words, different from that of lying to God, as if *Ananias* were accused for counterfeiting the Holy Ghost, it is most certain that the words can in this place bear no such sense; for the sin of *Ananias* is again expressed in the case of his wife *Sapphira*, to whom *S. Peter* said, *How is it that ye have agreed together to tempt the Spirit of the Lord?* but to tempt the Spirit, and to counterfeit the Spirit, are two several things. And it is evident that in this place the tempting of the Spirit, was nothing else but lying to him. For *S. Peter* said to *Sapphira*, *Tell me whether ye sold the land for so much; And she said, Yea, for so much.* In which answer she lied. Then *Peter* said unto her, *How is it that ye have agreed together to tempt the Spirit of the Lord? viz.* in saying that ye sold the land for so much. Here is no colour then for that new pretence, that *Ananias* did bear the Apostles in hand that what was done he did by the motion of the Holy Spirit, and so did pretend, counterfeit and belie the Holy Ghost. This is not to expound *S. Peter*, but to belie *Ananias*, and make him guilty of that sin which he was never yet accused of. It is most certain that he lied, it is also certain that he to whom

† Ex his facie
le apparet
hancquaquā
ex eo loco
concludi pos
se Spiritum S.
esse Deum, cū
alio modo de
Spiritu S. lo
quatur Petrus,
quar, alio de
Deo. Illic
dicit *mentiri*
se fallere, ac
iustificari Spi
ritum S. hic
mentiri Deo,
Cr. illius de uno
Deo Patre, J. I.
§ 3. Argum. I.

he lied was the Holy Ghost, and therefore it might be well † translated that *he lied to the Holy Ghost.*

† Our translation is here accused without reason.

For though the Original be *ἡμεῖς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον*, yet some Copies have it *εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα*, and the Syriack did so read and interpret it, *רוחא קדשא* the Vulgar Latine to the same purpose, *mentiri te Spiritui S.* And the Author of the Treatise de temp. Barbarico, under the name of S. Austin, *mentiri te apud Spiritum S. cap. 3.* Now *ἡμεῖς τὸ πνεῦμα* is the same with *τὸ πνεῦμα*, as *Μὴ ἡμεῖς εἰς ἀλλήλους*, Lie not one to another. If we read it *εἰς πνεῦμα* then, it is rightly translated. Again, if we read it *τὸ πνεῦμα*, it has in this case the sense of *τὸ πνεῦμα*. As Psal. 66. 1. *יְהוָה יִכְחֹשׁ אֵיבֵינוּ* LXX, *ἡμεῖς τὸ πνεῦμα* *οἱ ἐχθροὶ* Cx, of the same sense with that Psalm 18. 61. *יְהוָה יִכְחֹשׁ אֵיבֵינוּ* LXX, *καὶ ἡμεῖς οἱ ἐχθροὶ* Cx. And Isa. 57. 11. *יְהוָה יִכְחֹשׁ אֵיבֵינוּ* LXX, *καὶ ἡμεῖς οἱ ἐχθροὶ* Cx. And if we read it *εἰς πνεῦμα*, it is rightly translated to lie unto the Holy Ghost; and so agreeth with that which followeth to rectify the Holy Ghost, as Psalm 78. 36. *τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ ἡμεῖς*, and vers. 41. *ἐπὶ ἡμεῖς* & *ἐπὶ ἡμεῖς*. Therefore whatsoever shifts are laid upon the phrase, or difference of expressions, are either false or frivolous.

Next, because they may very well be conscious that this verbal or phraseological answer may not seem sufficient, they tell us though both the phrases were synonymous, yet they did no way prove that the Spirit is God: and the reason which they render to justify this negation, is, because there are several places of the Scripture, in which the messengers of God, who are acknowledged not to be God, are mentioned in the same relation unto God, as here the Spirit is. To which the answer is most plain and clear, that there is no creature ever mentioned in the same manner as the Holy Ghost is here. As when they alledge those words of the Apostle, *He therefore that despiseth, despiseth not man but God, who hath also given us his Holy Spirit:* I cannot see what similitude can be made unto the Scripture now in question: for if the Spirit be not understood in the first words, *he therefore that despiseth*, it hath no relation to the present question; and if it be, it were so far from being a confutation, that it would be another confirmation. As for the other, *He that heareth you, heareth me, he that despiseth you, despiseth me, and he that despiseth me, despiseth him that sent me;* it is so far from justifying their interpretation, that it hath nothing in it like that which sounds our reason; that is, no opposition. For there are three particulars in that Scripture which we produce for our Assertion; first, that they lied to the Holy Ghost; secondly, that, in doing so, they lied not unto men; and thirdly, that by the same act they lied unto God. In which the opposition is our foundation. For if the Spirit of God were not God, as we are sure it is not man; it might as well have been said, you lied not unto the Holy Ghost, but unto God. And indeed if the Apostles would have aggravated the sin of *Ananias* with the full propriety and iniquity, in their sense, he must have said, thou hast not lied unto men, nor unto the Spirit of God, but unto God. But being he first told him plainly his sin, *lying to the Holy Ghost*, and then let him know the sinfulness of it, *thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God:* it is evident that the Holy Ghost to whom he lied is God.

1 Thess. 4. 8.

Matt. 10. 40.
Luke 10. 16.

Thirdly, that Person whose inhabitation maketh a temple, is God: for if the notion of a temple be nothing else but to be the house of God, if to be the house of any creature is not to be a temple, as it is not, then no inhabitation of any created person can make a Temple. But the inhabitation of the Holy Ghost maketh a temple, as we are informed by the Apostle, *What, know ye not that our body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you?* Therefore the Holy Ghost is God.

1 Cor. 6. 19.

To this is replied indifferently according to the diversity of our Adversaries; as it is not probable that the deniers of so great a truth should agree. The first tell us that if we would enforce by this reason, that the Holy Ghost is God, we must † prove that he is a person, and that he doth possess our bodies by a

† Si quis ex eo quod corpus nostrum Spiritus S.

templum sit, concludere velit eum esse Deum, illi demonstrandum est ita corpus nostrum Spiritus S. templum dici, ut intelligatur eum esse personam cuius honor corpus nostrum sit dedicatum, à qua corpus nostrum eo jure quod divini numinis proprium est, possidetur, & principaliter incolatur, *Crellius de uno Deo Patre, l. 1. § 3.*

divine

divine right. But we have already proved that he is a Person, and certainly there can be no other right but that which belongs to God, by which the Holy Ghost inhabiteth and possesseth us. Nor have they any pretence to evince the contrary but that which more confirmeth our Assertion; for they urge onely those words of the Apostle, *Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you.* We do certainly know that we are the temple of God; and we also know that the Spirit of God therefore dwelleth in us; and we therefore know that we are the temple of God, because we know that the Spirit of God dwelleth in us; and we know no other reason why we are the temple of God, when the Spirit of God dwelleth in us, but onely because we know the Spirit of God is God; for if the Spirit were any other Person not divine, or any thing but a Person though divine, we could not by any means be assured that he did properly inhabit in us, or if he did, that by his inhabitation he could make a temple of us. The second hath very little to say, but onely this, that being the Holy Ghost who possesseth us, is a Person, we must shew that our bodies are his by the Highest interest, and primarily dedicated to his honour: which he therefore conceives we cannot shew, because he thinks our body is not at all his by interest, or dedicated to his honour. But it were very strange, if we should be baptized in the name of the Holy Ghost, and that the Holy Ghost should have no interest in us, but that he should be ours by interest, and not we his; that the Spirit of God should call for men to be separated to himself, and that they which are so separated should be no way dedicated to his honour. If the Holy Ghost had no interest in us, because he is given unto us, then *Christ* can have no interest in us, for he is also given unto us. Indeed if the Apostle had said, as our Adversary doth, that *we ought with our body to glorifie, not the Spirit but God*, I should have concluded that the Spirit is not God; but being that blessed Spirit which dwelleth in us, and spake by the Apostles, never taught us not to glorifie him, I shall rather take leave to suspect that of blasphemy, then the Assertion of his Deity to be false Divinity. And whereas it is said, that *the Apostle hath hinted in what respect our body is the temple of the Holy Spirit, to wit, by inhabitation*; this is so far from breeding in me the least thought of diminution, that by this onely notion I am fully confirmed in the belief of my Assertion. For I know no other way by which God peculiarly inhabiteth in us but by the inhabitation of the Spirit: and I understand no other way by which we can be the temple of God but by the inhabitation of God, as it is written, *Ye are the temple of the living God, as God hath said, I will dwell in them, and walk in them, and I will be their God, and they shall be my people*: And therefore I conclude that the Holy Ghost who by his inhabitation maketh our bodies temples, is that God which dwelleth in us.

Fourthly, He, to whom the divine attributes do belong as certainly as they belong unto God the Father, is truly and properly God; because those are divine attributes which are proprieties of the divine nature, and consequently none can be indued with them to whom the nature of God belongeth not. But the divine attributes, such as are Omniscience, Omnipotency, Omnipresence, and the like, do belong as certainly unto the Holy Ghost as they do unto God the Father. Therefore we are as much assured that the Holy Ghost is God. The Scriptures to prove these attributes are so well known, that I shall not need to mention them; and they are so many that to manage them against the exceptions of the Adversaries would take up too much room in this discourse: especially considering they question some of them in the Father as well as in the Spirit, and so I should be forced to a double proof.

Fifthly,

Fifthly, He, to whom are attributed those works which are proper unto God, by and for which God doth require of us to acknowledge and worship him as God, is properly and truly God: because the operations of all things flow from that essence by which they are, and therefore if the operations be truly divine, that is, such as can be produced by no other but God, then must the essence of that person which produceth them be truly such. But such works as are proper unto God, by and for which God hath required us to acknowledge him and worship him as God, are attributed often in the Scriptures to the Spirit of God, as the acts of Creation and Conservation of all things, the miracles wrought upon and by our blessed Saviour, the works of grace and power wrought in the hearts of true Believers, and the like. Therefore without any further disputation, which cannot be both long and proper for an Exposition, I conclude my third Assertion, that the Holy Ghost, or Spirit of God, is a Person truly and properly divine, the true and living God.

Now being we do firmly believe that the true and living God can be but one, that the infinity of the divine essence is incapable of multiplicity; being we have already shewn that the Father is originally that one God, which is denied by none, and have also proved that the onely Son is the same God, receiving by an eternal generation the same divine nature from the Father; it will also be necessary for the understanding of the nature of the Spirit of God, to shew how that blessed Spirit is God: to which purpose, that I may proceed methodically, my fourth Assertion is, that the Spirit of God, which is the true and living God, is neither God the Father, nor the Son of God.

First, though the Father be undoubtedly God, though the Holy Ghost be also God, and (because there cannot be two Gods,) the same God; yet the Holy Ghost is not the Father. For the Scriptures do as certainly distinguish them in their persons, as they do unite them in their nature. He which proceedeth from the Father is not the Father, because it is impossible any person should proceed from himself; but the Holy Ghost *proceedeth from the Father*; therefore he is not the Father. He which is sent by the Father and from the Father, is not the Father, by whom and from whom he is sent; for no person can be sent by himself, and by another from himself. But the Holy Ghost is sent by God the Father, and by the Son *from the Father*; therefore he is not the Father. John 15. 26.

Secondly, though we have formerly proved that the Son of God is properly and truly God, though we now have formerly proved that the Spirit of God is God, and in reference to both we understand the same God; yet the Holy Ghost is not the Son. For he which receiveth of that which is the Son's, and by receiving of it glorifieth the Son, cannot be the Son, because no person can be said to receive from himself that which is his own, and to glorify himself by so receiving. But the Comforter, *who is the Holy Ghost*, received of that which is the Son's, and by receiving of it glorified the Son; for so our Saviour expressly said, *He shall glorify me, for he shall receive of mine.* John 16. 15. Therefore the Holy Ghost is not the Son. Again, He whose coming depended upon the Son's departing, and his sending after his departure, cannot be the Son who therefore departed that he might send him. But the coming of the Holy Ghost depended upon the Son's departing, and his sending after his departure; as he told the Apostles before he departed, *I tell you the truth, it is expedient for you that I goe away; for if I goe not away the Comforter will not come unto you, but if I depart I will send him unto you:* therefore the Holy Ghost is not the Son.

Thirdly, though the Father be God, and the Son be God, and the Holy

T t

Ghost

Ghost be also the same God; yet we are assured that the Holy Ghost is neither the Father nor the Son; because the Scriptures frequently represent him as distinguished both from the Father and the Son. As, when *the Spirit of God descended like a dove, and loe, a voice from heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased,* he was manifestly distinguished from the person of the Son, upon whom he lighted, and from the person of the Father, who spake from heaven of his Son. The Apostle teacheth us that *through the Son we have an access by one Spirit unto the Father,* and consequently assureth us that the Spirit, *by whom,* is not the Father, *to whom,* nor the Son, *through whom,* we have that access. So God sent forth his Son, that we might receive the adoption of sons: and because we are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son, into our hearts, crying, *Abba, Father.* Where the Son is distinguished from the Father as first sent by him, and the Spirit of the Son is distinguished both from the Father and the Son, as sent by the Father after he had sent the Son. And this our Saviour hath taught us several times in a word, as, *The Comforter whom the Father will send in my name; the Comforter whom I will send unto you from the Father,* and when that Comforter is come, *Go teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.* I conclude therefore against the old \dagger Sabellian Herefie, that the Holy Ghost, although he be truly and properly God, is neither God the Father, nor God the Son; which is my fourth Assertion.

John 14.26.

15.26.

Matt. 28.19.

\dagger This Herefie was very ancient, even before Sabellius, though those

which held it were afterwards all so denominated from Sabellius. For we find it was the opinion of Praxeas, against whom Tertullian wrote, who being urged with that place where the three persons were distinguished, *The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee,* Therefore that which is born of thee shall be called the Son of God, answered thus, *Filius Dei Deus est, & virtus altissimi altissimus est.* After Praxeas followed Noetus, *μωνομις & αὐτὸν Πάτρις, & Τὸν, & ἄλλον Πνεύμα ἁγίου* Epiph. Her. 57. Noetiani à quodam Noeto, qui docebat Christum eundem ipsum esse Patrem & Spiritum S. S. Aug. Her. 36. Suddenly after Noetus arose Sabellius. *Δογματικὴ ἡ εἰς, καὶ οἱ αὐτὸν διὰ τὸν Σαβιλλιανὸν, & αὐτὸν ὁ Πάτρις, & αὐτὸν Τὸν, & αὐτὸν ὁ ἄλλον Πνεύμα, οἱ δὲ ὁ ἐν μὲν τῷ αὐτῷ οἱ τρεῖς ὁμοουσιᾶς,* Epiph. Her. 62. From him afterwards were all which held the same opinion called Sabellians. Sabelliani ab illo Noeto quem supra memoravimus defluxisse dicuntur. Nam & discipulum ejus quidam perhibent fuisse Sabellium. Sed qua causa duas hæreses Epiphanius computet nescio, cum fieri potuisse videamus, ut fuerit Sabellius iste famosior, & ideo ex illo celebrius hæc hæresis nomen acceperit. Noetiani enim difficilime ab aliquo sciuntur, Sabelliani autem sunt in ore multorum, S. Aug. Her. 41.

Our fifth Assertion is, that the Holy Ghost is the third Person in the blessed Trinity. For being he is a Person, by our first Assertion; a Person not created, by the second; but a divine Person, properly and truly God, by the third; being though he is thus truly God, he is neither the Father nor the Son, by the fourth Assertion, it followeth that he is one of the three; and of the three he is the third. For as there is a number in the Trinity, by which the Persons are neither more nor less than three, so there is also an order by which of these Persons the Father is the first, the Son the second, and the Holy Ghost the third. Nor is this order arbitrary or external, but internal and necessary, by virtue of a subordination of the second to the first, and of the third unto the first and second. The Godhead was communicated from the Father to the Son, not from the Son unto the Father; though therefore this were done from all eternity, and so there can be no priority of time, yet there must be acknowledged a priority of Order, by which the Father not the Son is first, and the Son not the Father second. Again, the same Godhead was communicated by the Father and the Son unto the Holy Ghost, not by the Holy Ghost to the Father or the Son: though therefore this was also done from all Eternity, and therefore can admit of no priority in reference to time; yet that of order must be here observed; so that the Spirit receiving the Godhead from the Father who is the first Person cannot be the first, receiving the same from the Son who is the second, cannot be the second, but being from the first and second must be of the three the third. And thus both the number and the order of the

the Persons are signified together by the Apostle saying, *There are three that bare record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one.* And though they are not expressly said to be three, yet the same number is sufficiently declared, and the same order is expressly mentioned, in the baptismal Institution made *in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.* As therefore we have formerly proved the Son to be truly the second Person, and at the same time the Father to be the first, so doth this which we have, but briefly, spoken, prove that the Holy Ghost is the † third; which is our fifth Assertion.

Our sixth and last Assertion, (sufficient to manifest the nature of the Holy Ghost, as he is the Spirit of God,) teacheth that Spirit to be a Person proceeding from the Father, and the Son. From whence at last we have a clear description of the blessed Spirit, that he is the most high and eternal God, of the same nature, attributes and operations with the Father, and the Son, as receiving the same essence from the Father and the Son, by proceeding from them both. Now this procession of the Spirit in reference to the Father is delivered expressly, in relation to the Son is contained virtually in the Scriptures. First, it is expressly said that the Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Father, as our Saviour testifieth, *When the Comforter is come whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me.* And this is also evident from what hath been already asserted: for being the Father and the Spirit are the same God, and being so the same in the unity of the nature of God, are yet distinct in their personality, one of them must have the same nature from the other, and because the Father hath been already shewn to have it from none, it followeth that the Spirit hath it from him.

Secondly, though it be not expressly spoken in the Scripture that the Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Son, yet the substance of the same truth is virtually contained there; because those very expressions which are spoken of the Holy Spirit in relation to the Father, for that reason because he proceedeth from the Father, are also spoken of the same Spirit in relation to the Son; and therefore there must be the same reason presupposed in reference to the Son, which is expressed in reference to the Father. Because the Spirit proceedeth from the Father, therefore it is called the Spirit of God and the Spirit of the Father. *It is not ye that speak, but the spirit of your Father which speaketh in you.* For by the language of the Apostle the Spirit of God is the Spirit which is of God, saying, *The things of God knoweth no man but the Spirit of God.* And we have received not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God. Now the same Spirit is also called the Spirit of the Son; for because we are Sons God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts: the Spirit of Christ, Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ he is none of his; even the Spirit of Christ which was in the Prophets; the Spirit of Jesus Christ, as the Apostle speaks, *I know that this shall turn to my salvation through my prayer and the supply of the Spirit of Jesus Christ.* If then the Holy Spirit be called the Spirit of God and the Father, because he proceeded from the Father, it followeth, that, being called also the Spirit of the Son, he proceedeth also from the Son.

Again, because the Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Father he is therefore sent by the Father, as from him who hath by the original communication a right of mission; as, *the Comforter which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send.* But the same Spirit which is sent by the Father, is also sent by the Son, as he saith, *when the Comforter is come whom I will send unto you.* Therefore the Son hath the same right of mission with the Father, and conse-

† Vide p. 68.
So Epiphanius
several times
calls the Holy
Spirit πνεύμα
τῆς οὐνοῦ καὶ
τῆς γῆς.

John 15. 26.

Matt. 10. 20.

1 Cor. 11. 12.

Gal. 4. 6.

Rom. 8. 9.

1 Pet. 1. 11.

Phil. 1. 19.

John 14. 26.

vation; for I have already proved this Spirit to be a Person properly divine, and consequently above all ministrations. But I intend thereby whatsoever is attributed unto him peculiarly in the salvation of man, as the work wrought by him, for which he is sent by the Father and the Son. For all the Persons in the Godhead are represented unto us as concurring unto our Salvation: *God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, and through that Son we have an access by one Spirit unto the Father* John 3.16. Ephes. 2.18. is therefore what our Saviour did and suffered for us belonged to that Office of a Redeemer which he took upon him: so whatsoever the Holy Ghost worketh in order to the same salvation, we look upon as belonging to his Office. And because without holiness it is impossible to please God, because we are all impure, and unholy, and the purity and holiness which is required in us to appear in the presence of God whose eyes are pure, must be wrought in us by the Spirit of God, who is called Holy because he is the cause of this holiness in us, therefore we acknowledge the Office of the Spirit of God to consist in the sanctifying of the servants of God, and the declaration of this Office, added to the description of his nature, to be a sufficient explication of the object of Faith contained in this Article *I believe in the Holy Ghost*.

Now this sanctification being opposed to our impurity and corruption, and answering fully to the latitude of it, whatsoever is wanting in our nature of that holiness and perfection, must be supplied by the Spirit of God. Wherefore being by nature we are totally void of all saving truth, and under an impossibility of knowing the will of God; being as *no man knoweth the things of a man save the spirit of man which is in him, even so none knoweth the things of God but the Spirit of God; this Spirit searcheth all things, yea the deep things of God, and revealeth them unto the sons of men; so that thereby the darkness of their understanding is expelled, and they are enlightened with the knowledge of their God.* This work of the Spirit is double, either external and general, or internal and particular. The external and general work of the Spirit, as to the whole Church of God, is the Revelation of the will of God, by which so much in all Ages hath been propounded as was sufficient to instruct men unto eternal life. For there have been *holy Prophets ever since the world began; and prophecies came not at any time by the will of man, but Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.* When it pleased God in the last days to speak unto us by his Son, even that Son sent his Spirit into the Apostles, the Spirit of truth, that he might guide them into all truth, teaching them all things, and bringing all things to their remembrance whatsoever Christ had said unto them. By this means it came to pass that *all Scripture was given by inspiration of God*, that is, by the motion and operation of the Spirit of God; and so whatsoever is necessary for us to know and believe, was delivered by Revelation. Again, the same Spirit which revealeth the Object of Faith generally to the Universal Church of God, which object is propounded externally by the Church to every particular Believer, doth also illuminate the understanding of such as believe that they may receive the truth. For Faith is the gift of God not onely in the object but also in the act; *Christ is not onely given unto us, in whom we believe, but it is also given us in the behalf of Christ to believe on him; and this gift is a gift of the Holy Ghost working within us an assent unto that which by the word is propounded to us: by this the Lord opened the heart of Lydia, that she attended unto the things which were spoken of Paul; by this the word preached profiteth being mixed with faith in them that hear it.* Thus by grace are we saved through faith, and that not of our selves, it is the gift of God. As the increase and perfection, so the

*John 3.16.
Ephes. 2.18.*

1 Cor. 2.10.11

*Luke 1.70.
2 Pet. 1.21.*

*Heb. 1.1.
John 16.13.*

Phil. 1.29

*Act. 16.14.
Heb. 4.2.
Ephes. 2.8.*

† This is the ancient determination of the second African Council. Si quis sic ut augmentum, ita etiam initium Fidei, ipsamque credulitatis

affectum quo in eum credimus qui iustificat impium, & ad regenerationem baptismatis pervenimus, non per gratia donum, id est, per inspirationem Spiritus S. corrigentis voluntatem nostram ab infidelitate ad fidem, ab impietate ad pietatem, & naturaliter nobis inesse dicit, Apostolicis dogmatibus adversarius approbatur, beato Paulo dicente, *Confidimus quia qui caput in vobis bonum opus profecerit usque in diem Domini nostri Jesu Christi*; & illud, *Vobis datum est pro Christo non solum ut in eum credatis, sed etiam ut pro illo patiamini*. Et, *Gratia salvi facti estis per fidem, non ex vobis, Dei enim donum est*, Can. 5. Concil. Ancy. & Gemad. Eccl. Dogm. cap. 42.

It was the known opinion of the Pelagians that it is in the power of man to believe the Gospel without any internal operation of the grace of God, and S. Austin was once of that opinion. Neque enim fidem putabam, says he, Dei gratia praeveniri, ut per illam nobis daretur quod polceremus utiliter, nisi quia credere non possemus, si non praeccederet praeconium veritatis. Ut autem praedicato nobis Evangelio consentiremus nostrum esse proprium, & nobis ex nobis esse arbitrabar. Quem meum errorem nonnulla Opuscula mea satis indicant ante Episcopatum meum scripta, De Praedest. Sact. l. 1. c. 3. But whatsoever he had so written before he was made a Bishop, he recalled and reversed in his Retractions, l. 1. c. 23. and disputed earnestly against it as a part of the Pelagian Heresy. This, as the rest of Pelagianism is renewed by the Socinians, who in the Racovian Catechism deliver it in this manner, Nonne ad credendum Evangelio Spiritus Sancti interioris dono opus est? Nullo modo: neque enim in Scripturis legimus cuiquam id conferri donum, nisi credenti Evangelio.

Tit. 3. 5.

1 Cor. 6. 11.

The second part of the Office of the Holy Ghost in the sanctification of man, is the regeneration and renovation of him. For our natural corruption consisting in an averfation of our wills, and a depravation of our affections, an inclination of them to the will of God is wrought within us by the Spirit of God. For according to his mercy he saveth us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost. So that except a man be born again of water and of the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God. We are all at first defiled by the corruption of our nature and the pollution of our sins; but we are washed, but we are sanctified, but we are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God. The second part then of the Office of the Holy Ghost is the renewing of man in all the parts and faculties of his Soul.

Gal. 5. 25.

Gal. 5. 16.

Rom. 8. 14.

Zach. 12. 10.

1 John 5. 14.

Rom. 8. 26. 27.

John 14. 16.

1 John 2. 1.

Rom. 8. 34.

The third part of this Office is to lead, direct, and govern us in our actions and conversations, that we may actually doe and perform those things which are acceptable and well-pleasing in the sight of God. If we live in the Spirit, quickened by his Renovation, we must also walk in the Spirit following his direction, led by his manuduction. And if we walk in the Spirit, we shall not fulfill the lusts of the flesh; for we are not onely directed, but animated and acted in those operations by the Spirit of God, who giveth both to will and to doe, and as many as are thus led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God. Moreover that this direction may prove more effectual, we are also guided in our prayers, and acted in our devotions by the same Spirit, according to the promise, *I will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem the spirit of grace and of supplications*. Whereas then this is the confidence that we have in him, that if we ask any thing according to his will he heareth us; and whereas we know not what we should pray for as we ought, the Spirit it self maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered, and he that searcheth the hearts knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit, because he maketh intercession for the Saints according to the will of God. From which intercession especially I conceive he hath the name of the Paraclete given him by Christ, who said, *I will pray unto the Father, and he shall give you another Paraclete*. For if any man sin we have a Paraclete with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous, saith S. John: who also maketh intercession for us, saith S. Paul; and

Fifthly, it is the Office of the Holy Ghost to assure us of the adoption of Sons, to create in us a sense of the paternal love of God toward us, to give us an earnest of our everlasting inheritance. *The love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us. For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God. And because we are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying Abba Father. For we have not received the Spirit of bondage again to fear; but we have received the Spirit of adoption whereby we cry Abba Father. The Spirit it self bearing witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God. As therefore we are born again by the Spirit, and receive from him our Regeneration, so we are also assured by the same Spirit of our Adoption; and because being sons we are also heirs, heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ, by the same Spirit we have the pledge, or rather the earnest, of our inheritance. For he which establisheth us in Christ and hath anointed us is God, who hath also sealed us, and hath given the earnest of his Spirit in our hearts; so that we are sealed with that holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance untill the redemption of the purchased possession.* The Spirit of God as given unto us in this life, though it have not the proper nature of a pledge; as in the gifts received here being no way equivalent to the promised reward, nor given in the stead of any thing already due; yet is to be looked upon as an earnest, being part of that reward which is promised, and, upon the condition of performance of the Covenant which God hath made with us, certainly to be received.

† The word ἀρραβών which the Apostle only useth in this

particular, is of an Hebrew extraction, ערבוּ from ערב a word of promise and engagement in commerce, bargains, and agreements; and being but in one particular affair used in the old Testament, is taken for a pledge, Gen. 38. 17, 18, 20. and translated ἀρραβών by the LXX, as well as ערבוּ by the Chaldee; yet the Greek word otherwise, consonantly enough to the origination, signifies rather an earnest than a pledge, as the Greeks and Latins generally agree. Hesych. Ἀρραβών, ὁ ἀρραβών, Εὐθύμ. Ἀρραβών, ὁ ἐπὶ τῷ ἀνδρὶ δαδὸς ὡς ἀρραβὼν διδομένη ἀρραβὼν ἐστὶν ἀρραβών. Which words are also extant in Suidas, but corruptly. To this purpose is cited that of Menander, Μικρὸν μὲν ἀρραβὼν μὲν ἐπεσθῆναι τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἀρραβὼν. So Aristotle speaking of Thales, ἐμπόρου τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἀρραβὼν διδομένη ἦν ἀρραβών. Polit. l. c. 11. So the Latins, Arrabo sic dicta ut reliquum reddatur. Hoc verbum à Græco ἀρραβών. Reliquum ex eo quod debitum reliquit, Varro de L. L. lib. 4. In terrenis negotiis arrhæ quantitas, contractus illius pro quo intercesserit quadam portio est; pignoris vero ratio meritum rei pro qua poni videtur excedit. Paschasius Diaconus, l. 1. de Sp. S. Pignus Latinus Interpret pro arrabone posuit. Non idipsum autem arrabo quod pignus sonat. Arrabo enim futuræ emptioni quasi quoddam testimonium & obligamentum datur. Pignus vero, hoc est, ἐνέχυρον, pro mutua pecunia opponitur, ut cum illa reddita fuerit reddenti debitum pignus à creditore reddatur, S. Hieron. ad Ephes. 1. 14. There is, such another observation in A. Gellius, upon these words of Q. Claudius, Cum tantus arrhabo penes Samnites Populi Romani esset, Arrabonem dixit sexcentos obsoles, & id maluit quam pignus dicere, quoniam vis hujus vocabuli in ea sententia gravior acriorque est, Noct. Att. lib. 17. cap. 2. The sense and use of this word is evident in Plautus, Eas quanti destinat? Talentis magnis totidem, quot ego & tu sumus. Sed arrhaboni has dedit quadraginta minas, Mostellaria. The sum was 120 l. of which he gave 40 l. in part of payment, and this was the arrhabe. So the Greek Fathers interpret S. Paul, διὰ τὸ τοῦ ἀρραβὸν ἡνέκατο ὅτι δόθηκεν τὸ μέγεθος ὁ δὲ ἀρραβὼν μικρὸν τὸ μὲν δὲ παρὸς, Theodoret 2 Cor. 1. 22. & 1 Cor. 15. 44. διὰ τὸ τοῦ ἀρραβὸν τὸ γὰρ δόδιν ὀνομάζετο, ὡς πωλημάτων ἐστὶ δόθηκεν ὁ δὲ ἀρραβὼν ὡς ἀρραβὼν, Οὐδὲ Πνεῦμα εἰς πᾶσι δόθηκεν, ἀλλὰ ἀρραβὼν ὡς ἀρραβὼν, ἵνα ἀπὸ τούτου καὶ ἀπὸ τούτου δαίμονι, S. Chrysost. In this manner speaks Eusebius, Τὸ ἀρραβὼν ἡνέκατο ἐνδὲν ἀρραβωνίζετο, De vita Constant. l. 1. c. 3. Theodor. in Cl. Alex. 802. Οὐτε δὲ πᾶν κακοῦ μεμα, ἔτε παρὸς ὑπερῶν ἀλλ' οὐ ἀρραβὼν ὡς ἀρραβὼν ἀρραβὼν καὶ παρὸς πᾶσι ἀρραβωνίζετο. So Tertullian. Hic sequester Dei atque hominum appellatus ex utriusque partis deposito commissio sibi carnis quoque depositum servat in semetipso, arrabonem summæ totius. Quemadmodum enim nobis arrabonem Spiritus reliquit, ita & à nobis arrabonem carnis accepit, & vexit in cælum pignus totius summæ illuc quandoque redigendæ. De Resur. carnis, c. 51. Planè accepit & hic Spiritum caro: sed arrabonem, animæ autem non arrabonem sed plenitudinem, cap. 53. So though the Translator of Irenæus render ἀρραβὼν pignus, yet it is evident that Irenæus did understand by ἀρραβὼν an earnest. Quod & pignus, dixit Apostolus, hoc est parte ejus honoris qui à Deo nobis promissus est, in Epistola quæ ad Ephesios est, l. 5. c. 8. and a little after, Si enim pignus complectens hominem in semetipsum jam facit dicere Abba Pater, quid faciet universa Spiritus gratia quæ hominibus dabitur à Deo, cum similes nos ei efficiet, & perficiet voluntate Patris?

Eph. 4. 12.

Sixthly, for the effecting of all these and the like particulars, it is the Office of the same Spirit to sanctifie and set apart Persons for the duty of the Ministry, ordaining them to intercede between God and his People, to send up prayers to God for them, to bless them in the name of God, to teach the doctrine of the Gospel, to administer the Sacraments instituted by Christ, to perform all things necessary for the perfecting of the Saints, for the work of the Ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ. The same Spirit which illuminated the Apostles, and endued them with power from above to perform personally

2 Cor. 13. 14.
Rom. 8. 9.

1 Cor. 12. 3.

the excellency of his graces, and the abundance of his gifts. What the Apostle wished to the *Corinthians*, ought to be the earnest petition of every Christian, that *the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost be with us all.* For if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his; if he have not that which maketh the union, he cannot be united to him: if he acknowledgeth him not to be his Lord, he cannot be his servant; and no man can say that *Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost.* That which is born of the Spirit is spirit; such is their felicity which have it; that which is born of the flesh is flesh; such is their infelicity which want it. What then is to be desired in comparison of the supply of the Spirit of Jesus Christ; especially considering the encouragement we receive from Christ, who said, *If ye being evil know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him?*

1 Thess. 4. 3.

2 Thess. 2. 13.

1 Pet. 1. 2.

Heb. 12. 14.

2 Cor. 12. 1.

1 Cor. 3. 16,

37.

1 Cor. 3. 16.

1 Cor. 6. 19,

20.

1 Thess. 3. 13.

Thirdly, it is necessary to profess faith in the Holy Ghost, that *the will of God may be effectual in us, even our sanctification.* For if God hath from the beginning chosen us to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit; if we be elected according to the foreknowledge of God the Father through sanctification of the Spirit unto obedience, if the office of the Spirit doth consist in this, and he be therefore called Holy because he is to sanctifie us, how should we follow peace with all men and holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord? how should we endeavour to cleanse our selves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God? The temple of God is holy, which temple we are, if the Spirit of God dwelleth in us; for the inhabitation of God is a consecration; and that place must be a temple where his honour dwelleth. Now if we know that our body is the temple of the Holy Ghost within us which we have of God, if we know that we are not our own, for that we are bought with a price; we must also know that we ought therefore to glorify God in our body and in our spirit, which are God's. Thus it is necessary to believe in the Spirit of Sanctification, that our hearts may be established unblameable in holiness before God, even our Father, at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ with all his Saints.

Rom. 14. 17.

Acts 13. 52.

1 Thess. 1. 6.

John 7. 38.

Psal. 45. 7.

Heb. 1. 9.

1 John 2. 20,

27.

Fourthly, it is necessary to believe in the Holy Ghost, that in all our weaknesses we may be strengthened, in all our infirmities we may be supported, in all our discouragements we may be comforted, in the midst of miseries we may be filled with peace and inward joy. For *the kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost.* We reade of the Disciples at first, that they were filled with joy and with the Holy Ghost; and those which afterwards became followers of them and of the Lord, received the word in much affliction, but with joy of the Holy Ghost. These are the rivers of living water flowing out of his belly that believeth; this is the oyl of gladness wherewith the Son of God was anointed above his fellows, but yet with the same oyl his fellows are anointed also: for we have an unction from the Holy One, and the anointing which we receive of him abideth in us.

Luke 4. 18.

John 20. 21,

22.

1 Tim. 5. 22.

Tit. 1. 5.

Lastly, the belief of the Holy Ghost is necessary for the continuation of a successive Ministry, and a Christian submission to the acts of their function, unto the end of the world. For as God the Father sent the Son, and the Spirit of the Lord was upon him, because he had anointed him to preach the Gospel, so the Son sent the Apostles, saying, *As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you; and when he had said this he breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive the Holy Ghost:* and as the Son sent the Apostles, so did they send others by the virtue of the same Spirit, as S. Paul sent Timothy and Titus, and gave them power to send others, saying to Timothy, *Lay hands suddenly on no man,* and to Titus, *For this cause left I thee in Crete that thou shouldst set in order the things that*

that are wanting, and ordain Elders in every City, as I had appointed thee. Thus by virtue of an Apostolical Ordination there is for ever to be continued a Ministerial succession. Those which are thus separated by Ordination to the work of the Lord, are to feed the flock of God which is among them, taking the oversight thereof; and those which are committed to their care, are to remember and obey them that have the rule over them, and submit themselves, for that they watch for their souls as they that must give account. 1 Pet. 5. 2.

Heb. 13. 7, 17.

Having thus at large asserted the verity contained in this Article, and declared the necessity of believing it, we may easily give a brief exposition, by which every Christian may know what he ought to profess, and how he is to be understood, when he saith, *I believe in the Holy Ghost.* For thereby he is conceived to declare thus much, I freely and resolutely assent unto this as unto a certain and infallible truth, that beside all other whatsoever, to whom the name of Spirit is or may be given, there is one particular and peculiar Spirit, who is truly and properly a person, of a true real and personal subsistence, not a created but uncreated Person, and so the true and one eternal God; that though he be that God, yet is he not the Father nor the Son, but the Spirit of the Father and the Son, the third Person in the blessed Trinity, proceeding from the Father and the Son: I believe this infinite and eternal Spirit to be not onely of perfect and indefectible holiness in himself, but also to be the immediate cause of all holiness in us, revealing the pure and undefiled will of God, inspiring the blessed Apostles, and enabling them to lay the foundation, and by a perpetual succession to continue the edification of the Church, illuminating the understandings of particular persons, rectifying their wills and affections, renovating their natures, uniting their persons unto Christ, assuring them of the adoption of sons, leading them in their actions, directing them in their devotions, by all ways and means purifying and sanctifying their souls and bodies, to a full and eternal acceptance in the sight of God. This is the eternal Spirit of God; in this manner is that Spirit holy: and thus *I believe in the Holy Ghost.*

ARTICLE IX.

The holy Catholick Church, the Communion of Saints.

IN this ninth Article we meet with some variety of position, and with much addition, for whereas it is here the ninth, in some Creeds we find it the * last, and whereas it consisteth of two distinct parts, the latter is wholly added, and the former partly augmented; the most Ancient professing no more then to believe † *the Holy Church*, and the Greeks having added by way of explication or determination, the word *Catholick*, it was at last received into the Latine Creed.

* Although generally the Article of the Holy Church did immediately follow the Article of the Holy Ghost,

as Tertullian well observeth, Cum sub tribus & testatio fidei & sponso salutis pignerentur, necessario adjicitur Ecclesiae mentio, quoniam ubi tres, id est Pater & Filius & Spiritus Sanctus, ibi Ecclesia quæ trium corpus est, *De Baptismo* c. 6. and *S. Aug. in Enchir. c. 56.* Spiritus S. si creatura non Creator esset, profecto creatura rationalis esset. Ipse enim esset summa creatura; & ideo in Regula fidei non poneretur ante Ecclesiam, quia & ipse ad Ecclesiam pertineret. and the Author of the first Book de Symbolo ad Catechumenos, Sequitur post S. Trinitatis commendationem S. Ecclesia, and S. Hierom cited in the next Note. Yet notwithstanding this order was not always observed, but sometimes this Article was reserved to the end of the Creed. As first appeareth in that remarkable place of S. Cyprian. Quod si aliquis illud opponit ut dicat eandem Novatianam legem tenere quam Catholica Ecclesia tenet, eodem Symbolo quo & nos baptizare, eundem nosse Deum Patrem, eundem Filium Christum, eundem Spiritum S. ac propter hoc usurpare eum potestatem baptizandi posse, quod videatur in Interrogatione baptismi à nobis non discrepare; sciat quisquis & hoc opponendum putat, primum non esse unam nobis & Schismaticis Symboli legem, neque eandem interrogationem. Nam cum dicunt, *Credis remissionem peccatorum & vitam æternam per sanctam Ecclesiam?* mentiuntur in interrogatione, cum non habeant Ecclesiam. Tunc deinde voce sua ipsi confitentur remissionem peccatorum non dari nisi per Sanctam Ecclesiam, *Epist. ad Magnum.* Thus Arius and Euzoius, in the words hereafter cited, place the Church in the conclusion of their Creed. And the Author of the second Book de Symbolo ad Catechumenos, placeth the Remission of sins after the Holy Ghost, Noli injuriam facere ei qui te fecit, ut consequaris ab illo quod in isto S. Symbolo sequitur, *Remissionem omnium peccatorum:* and after he hath spoken of the Resurrection and life everlasting; proceedeth thus to speak of the Church, Sancta Ecclesia, in qua omnis Sacramenti terminatur autoritas, &c. The Author of the third, Ideo Sacramenti hujus conclusio per Ecclesiam terminatur, quia ipsa est mater fecunda. And the Author of the fourth, Per sanctam Ecclesiam. Propterea hujus conclusio Sacramenti per S. Ecclesiam terminatur, quoniam si quis absque ea inventus fuerit, alienus erit à numero filiorum; nec habebit Deum Patrem qui Ecclesiam noluerit habere matrem. Thus therefore they disposed the last part of the Creed, *Credo in Spiritum S. peccatorum remissionem, carnis resurrectionem & vitam æternam per S. Ecclesiam.* And the design of this transposition was to signify that remission of sins, and resurrection to eternal life, are to be obtained in and by the Church. As the Creed in the first Homily under the name of S. Chrysostom, *Credo in Spiritum S. Iste Spiritus perducit ad S. Ecclesiam, ipsa est quæ dimittit peccata, promittit carnis resurrectionem, promittit vitam æternam.*

† Tertull. Quo est mater nostra, in quam repromissimus Sanctam Ecclesiam, *adv. Marcion. l. 5. c. 4.* So Rufinus, Sanctam Ecclesiam. For Catholicam is added by Pamelius. So S. Hierom contra Lucifer. Præterea cum solenne sit in lavacro post Trinitatis Confessionem interrogare, *Credis Sanctam Ecclesiam? Credis remissionem peccatorum? Quam Ecclesiam credidisse cum dices? Arianoium?* sed non habent: nostram? sed extra hanc baptizatus non potuit eam credere quam nescivit; and S. August. *De Fide & Symb.* Credimus & sanctam Ecclesiam, with this declaration, utique Catholicam. So Maximus Taurin. Chrysol. and Venantius Fortunatus. The Author of the first Book de Symbolo ad Catechum. Sequitur post Sanctam Trinitatis commendationem Sancta Ecclesia. The Author of the other three, who placeth this Article last of all, Sancta Ecclesia, in qua omnis hujus sacramenti terminatur autoritas, l. 2. and l. 4. expressly Per Sanctam Ecclesiam, as the words of the Creed with the explication before mentioned. As also the Interrogation of the Novatians ending with per Sanctam Ecclesiam, cited before out of Saint Cyprian. So likewise of those two Homilies on the Creed which are falsely attributed to S. Chrysostom, the first hath Sanctam Ecclesiam after the Belief in the Holy Ghost, the second concludeth the Creed with per Sanctam Ecclesiam. In Carnis resurrectione fides, in vita æterna spes, in Sancta Ecclesia charitas. Thus the Ancient Saxon Creed set forth by Frobenius, Tha halgan gelarhinge, i. e. the holy Church; the Greek Creed in Saxon letters in Sir Robert Cotton's Library, and the old Latine Creed in the Oxford Library. Deus qui in cælis habitat, & condidit ex nihilo ea quæ sunt, & multiplicavit propter Sanctam Ecclesiam suam, irascitur tibi, *Hermas, l. 1. Visioe 1.* Virtute sua potenti condidit Sanctam Ecclesiam suam, ibi. Rogabam Dominum ut Revelationes ejus quas mihi ostendit per Sanctam Ecclesiam suam confirmaret, *Vif. 4.* But though it were not in the Roman or Occidental Creeds, yet it was anciently in the Oriental, particularly in that of Hierusalem, and that of Alexandria. In the Creed at Hierusalem it was certainly very ancient, for it is expounded by S. Cyril, Archbishop of that place, *ἐκ μίαν ἁγίαν Καθολικὴν Ἐκκλησίαν.* And in the Alexandrian it was as ancient, for Alexander Archbishop of that place inserts it in his Confession, in his Epistle ad Alexandrum, *μίαν καὶ ἁγίαν καθολικὴν τὴν Ἀποστολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν,* Theodoret. *Hist. l. 2. c. 4.* And Arius and Euzoius in their Confession of faith given in to Constantine, thus conclude *καὶ ἐκ Καθολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας ὅς ἐστι, τὴν καὶ μετὰ τὸν ἁγίον πνεῦμα ὡς ἀπάντων,* Socrates *Hist. Eccl. l. 1. c. 26.* The same is also expressed in both the Creeds, the lesser and the greater, delivered by Epiphanius in Ancorato; the words are repeated in the next Observation.

To begin then with the first part of the Article, I shall endeavour so to expound it, as to shew what is the meaning of the *Church*, which *Christ* hath propounded to us, how that Church is *holy*, as the Apostle hath assured us, how that holy Church is *Catholick*, as the Fathers have taught us. For when I say

say, *I believe in the Holy Catholick Church*, I mean that *there is a Church which is holy, and which is Catholick, and I understand that Church alone which is both Catholick and holy : and being this holiness and Catholickism are but affections of this Church which I believe, I must first declare what is the nature and notion of the Church, how am I assured of the existence of that Church, and then how it is the subject of those two affections.

* Credo sanctam Ecclesiam, I believe there is a holy Church ; or Credo in sanctam Ecclesiam, is the same : nor does the parti-

cle in added or substracted make any difference. For although some of the Latine and Greek Fathers press the force of that Proposition as is before observed, though Rufinus wge it far in this particular. Ut autem una eademque in Trinitate divinitas doceatur, sicut dictum est in Deo Patre credi adjecta prepositione, ita & in Christo Filio ejus, ita & in Spiritu S. memoratur. Sed ut manifestius fiat quod dicimus, ex consequentibus approbabitur. Sequitur namque post hunc sermonem, Sanctam Ecclesiam, remissionem peccatorum, hujus carnis resurrectionem. Non dicit, in sanctam Ecclesiam, nec in remissionem peccatorum, nec in carnis resurrectionem, si enim addidisset in prepositionem, una eademque vis fuisset cum superioribus. Ne autem (f. Nunc autem) in illis quidem vocabulis, ubi divinitate fides ordinatur, in Deo Patre dicitur, & Jesu Christo Filio ejus, & in Spiritu S. in cæteris vero ubi non de divinitate sed de creaturis ac mysteriis sermo est, præpositio non additur ut dicatur in sanctam Ecclesiam, sed Sanctam Ecclesiam credendam esse, non ut in Deum sed ut Ecclesiam Deo congregatam ; & remissionem peccatorum credendam esse, non in remissionem peccatorum, & resurrectionem carnis, non in resurrectionem carnis. Hac itaque prepositionis syllaba creator à creaturis secernitur & divina separantur ab humanis, Russ. in Symb. Though I say, this expression be thus pressed ; yet we are sure that the Fathers did use eis and in for the rest of the Creed as well as for the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. we have already produced the authorities of S. Cyril, Arius and Euzoius, p. 18, 19. and that of Epiphanius in Ancorato. Toms also the Latines, as S. Cyprian, In æternam pœnam sero credent, qui in vitam æternam credere noluerunt, Ad Demetrianum. So Interpres Irenæi, Quotquot autem timent Deum, & credunt in adventum Filii ejus, &c. So Chrysost. In Sanctam Ecclesiam. Quia Christus, & in Ecclesia Christus est, qui ergo Ecclesiam faceret, in Ecclesiam se confestim est credidisse, Sym. 62. And in the ancient edition of S. Jerome in the place before cited it was read. Credis in sanctam Ecclesiam, and the word in was left out by Victorinus.

For the understanding of the true notion of the Church, first we must observe that the nominal definition or derivation of the word is not sufficient to describe the nature of it. If we look upon the old English word now in use, ∴ Church or Kirk, it is derived from the Greek, and first signified the house of the Lord, that is, of Christ, and from thence was taken to signifie the people of God, meeting in the house of God. The Greek word used by the Apostles to expresse the Church, signifieth * a calling forth, if we look upon the origination ; a congregation of men, or a company assembled, if we consider the use of it. But neither of these doth fully expresse the nature of the Church, what it is in it self, and as it is propounded to our Belief.

∴ Kles the Lord, and that properly Christ ; from whence Kuei-ands belonging to the Lord Christ oik- Kuei-ands, the Lords house,

from whence Kyriac, Kyrk, and Church.

* The word used by the Apostles is Ἐκκλησία, from ἐκκαλεῖν evocare. From ἐκκαλεῖν, ἐκκλησις ; from ἐκκλησις, ἐκκλησία, of the same notation with the Hebrew קהל ecclesia quippe ex vocatione appellata est, S. Aug. Exp. ad Rom. And though they ordinarily take it primarily to signifie convocation, as S. Aug. Iner congregationem, unde synagoga, & convocationem, unde Ecclesia nomen habet, distat aliquid, Enar. in Psal. 177. yet the Origination speaks onely of evocation, without any intimation of congregation or meeting together, as there is in σύγκλησις. From whence arose that definition of Methodius, "Ὅτι Ἐκκλησία ἐστὶ τὸ ἐκκλητικόν τῶν ἡδονῶν ἀγρυπνῶντων, Photius Biblioth. where as ἐκκαλεῖν is here no more then καλεῖν, ἐκκλησις no more then κλήσις ; as κλητὸν and ἐκκλητὸν with the Atticks were the same ; From whence it came to pass that the same preposition hath been twice added in the composition of the same word ; from ἐκκαλεῖν ἐκκλησία, from whence ἐκκλησιάζειν, and because the preposition had no signification in the use of that word, from whence ἐκκλησιάζειν, to convocate, or call together. But yet ἐκκλησία is not the same with ἐκκλησις, not the evocation or the action of calling, but the κλητοί, or the company called, and that (according to the use) gathered together ; from whence ἐκκλησιάζειν is to gather together, or to be gathered. Hence S. Cyril, Ἐκκλησία ἡ κλήσις θεωρούμενη, διὰ τὸ πάντας ἐκκαλεῖν, & οὕτως συναγεῖν, Catech. 18. So Ammonius, Ἐκκλησία ἔστιν οἱ Ἀθληταὶ τοῦ σωθῶντος ἡρώτου πόνου. To this purpose do the LXX use ἐκκλησιάζειν actively, to convocate or call together an Assembly, as ἐκκλησιάζειν λαόν, and ἐκκλησιάζειν συναγωγὴν, and ἐκκλησιάζειν passively, as ἐκκλησιάζει πάντα ἡ συναγωγὴ, which the Attick writers would have expressed by ἐκκλησιάζειν, as Aristophanes ; Ἐδοξέ μοι εἶπε πρὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐν τῇ πόλει Ἐκκλησιάζειν πᾶσι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, Vespsis. where though the Scholiast hath rendered it Ἐκκλησιάζειν, εἰς ἐκκλησίαν συναγεῖν, whereby the Lexicographers have been deceived, yet the word is even there taken as a neuter, in the passive sense, as generally the Atticks use it. Howsoever from the notation of the word we cannot conclude that it signifies a number of men called together into one assembly out of the mass or generality of mankind ; first, because the preposition ἐκ hath no such force in the use of the word ; secondly, because the collection or coming together is not specified in the origination.

Our second Observation is, that the Church hath been taken for the whole complex of Men and Angels worshipping the same God ; and again, the Angels being not considered, it hath been taken as comprehending all the sons of men believing in God ever since the * foundation of the world. But being Christ took not upon him the nature of Angels, and consequently did not properly purchase them with his blood, or call them by his word ; being they

* Translatus in Paradisum jam tunc de mundo in Ecclesiam. Tertull. 12. adv. Marcion.

are

they that gladly received his word were baptized, and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls. These being thus added to the rest, continued stedfastly in the Apostles doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread and in prayers: and all these persons so continuing are called the Church. What this Church was is easily determined, for it was a certain number of men, of which some were Apostles, some the former Disciples, others were persons which repented, and believed, and were baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, and continued hearing the word preached, receiving the Sacraments administred, joyning in the publick prayers presented unto God. This was then the Church, which was daily increased by the addition of other persons received into it upon the same conditions, making up a multitude of them that believed, who were of one heart and one soul, believers added to the Lord, multitudes both of men and women.

. Cum re-
 misissent
 summi Sacer-
 dotes Petrum
 & Joannem
 & reversi es-
 sent ad reli-
 quos coapo-
 stolos & Di-
 scipulos Do-
 mini, id est
 in Ecclesiam,
 S. Irenaus,
 3. c. 3.
 Acts 4. 32.
 Acts 5. 14.

But though the Church was thus begun, and represented unto us as one in the beginning, though that Church which we profess to believe in the Creed be also propounded unto us as one ; and so the notion of the Church in the Acts of the Apostles might seem sufficient to express the nature of that Church which we believe ; yet because that Church was one by way of † origination, and was afterwards divided into many, the actual members of that one becoming the members of several Churches ; and that Church which we believe , is otherwise one by way of complexion, receiving the members of all Churches into it ; it will be necessary to consider how at the first those several Churches were constituted, that we may understand how in this one Church they were all united. To which purpose it will be farther fit to examine the several acceptations of this word as it is diversly used by the Holy Ghost in the New Testament ; that, if it be possible, nothing may escape our search, but that all things may be weighed, before we collect and conclude the full notion of the *Church* from thence.

† Hæ voces
Ecclesiæ, ex
qua habuit
omnis Eccle-
sia initium.
S. Iren. ibid.

First then that word which signifies the *Church* in the original Greek, is sometimes used in the vulgar sense, according as the native *Greeks* did use the same to express their conventions, without any relation to the worship of God or *Christ*, and therefore is translated by the word *assembly*, of as great a latitude. Secondly, it is sometimes used in the same notion in which the Greek Translators of the Old Testament made use of it, for the Assembly of the people of God under the Law, and therefore might be most fitly translated the *Congregation*, as it is in the Old Testament. Thirdly, it has been conceived that even in the Scriptures it is sometimes taken for the place in which the members of the Church did meet to perform their solemn and publick services unto God; and some † passages there are which seem to speak no less, but yet are not so certainly to be understood of the place, but that they may as well be spoken of the people congregated in a certain place. Beside these few different acceptions, the *Church* in the language of the New Testament doth always signify a company of persons professing the Christian Faith, but not always in the same latitude. Sometimes it admitteth of distinction and plurality, sometimes it reduceth all into conjunction and unity. Sometimes the Churches of God are diversified as many; sometimes, as many as they are, they are all comprehended in one.

**Acts 19.32,
39, 40.**

Acts 8. 38.
Heb. 2. 12.

† Acts 11.26.
1 Cor. 11.18,
22. From
these places
S. Augustine
did collect
that **EXLA-**
NDIA was taken
in the Scrip-
tures for the
place of meet-
ing, or the
house of God,
and came so to

be frequently used in the language of Christians in his time. Sicur Ecclesia dicitur locus, quo Ecclesia congregatur. Nam Ecclesia homines fuit de quibus dicitur, ut exhiberet sibi gloriosum Ecclesiam. Hanc tamen vocari etiam ipsam domum orationum idem Apostolus testis est, ubi ait, *Nunquid domos non habetis ad manducandum & bibendum, Ecclesiam Dei contemnitis?* Et hoc quotidianus loquendi usus obtinuit, ut, ad Ecclesiam prodire, aut ad Ecclesiam confugere, non dicitur, nisi quod ad locum ipsum parietesque prodierit, vel confugerit quibus Ecclesie congregatio continetur, *Quest. super Levit. l. 3. c. 57. By these words it is signified that in St. Augustin's time they used the word Ecclesia, as we do now the Church, for a place set apart for the worship of God; and it is also certain that those of the Greek Church did use Ἐκκλησία in the same sense, as Eusebius speaking of the flourishing times of the Church, before the persecution under Dioclesian, says the Christians ἀνέστησαν ἐν τῇ πόλει καὶ οἶκον οὐρανίου ἀποδείξαντες ἐνδοξίας αὐτοῦ*

παρὰ τὸ ἀνα πάσαις ταῖς πόλεσι ἐκ διμυρίων ἀνθρώπων ἐκκλησίαις, Hist. lib. 8. cap. 1. and S. Chrysostom, Πρὸς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν καὶ σακε-
σαι χαρίτων καὶ ἀνθρώπων, πολλὰ μᾶλλον ἢ τὰν πόλιν, καὶ ὁ ἀνθρώπος ἐκκλησία, Σεμνότερον, Hom. 16. ad Rom. But it is
not so certain that the Apostle used Ἐκκλησία in that sense, nor is it certain that there were any houses set apart for the worship of God
in the Apostles times, which then could be called by that name. For Isidorus Pelusiota expressly denies it, and distinguishes between
Ἐκκλησία and Ἐκκλησιαστέιον, after this manner Ἄλλο δὲ τὸ Ἐκκλησία, καὶ ἄλλο Ἐκκλησιαστέιον, ἢ τὸ ἐκ τῶν ἀμύμων ἡρώων
συνέστηκε, τὸ δὲ τὸ πλῆθος καὶ ἐκ τῶν οἰκονομῶν. And thus he proveth this distinction, Ὡστερὰ δὲ ἄλλο δὲ συνεκτικόν καὶ ἄλλο
δυσία, καὶ ἄλλο συμματτειον καὶ ἄλλο θυμίσμα, καὶ ἄλλο βαλδύθειον καὶ ἄλλο βαλὴ· τὸ μὲν δὲ τὸ πλῆθος ἐν τῷ συνεκτικῷ μιλῶν, ἢ
τὸν βαλδύθειον ἀνδρῶν, οἷς καὶ ὁ κινδυνὸς καὶ ἡ σωματικὴ ἀνίκη, ἔτι καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ Ἐκκλησιαστικῷ καὶ τῷ Ἐκκλησίᾳ. Then he concludes
that in the Apostles times there were no Ἐκκλησιαστέια, Ἐπὶ αὐτῶν Ἀποστόλων οὐτε ἡ Ἐκκλησία ἐκ τῶν μὴ χαρίων πόλιν
ἵκοιτο, ἔστιν ὅτι πᾶσι λαοῖς, ἐκκλησιαστέια ἔκλειπεν, Epist. 246. l. 2.

∴ Acts 16. 5. For first in general there are often mentioned ∴ the Churches by way of plu-
1 Cor. 14. 34. rality, the Churches of God, the Churches of the Gentiles, the Churches of the
2 Cor. 8. 19, Saints. In particular we find a few Believers gathered together in the house
23, 24. of one single person, called a * Church, as the Church in the house of Priscilla
11. 8, 28. and Aquila, the Church in the house of Nymphas, the Church in the house of
12. 13. Philemon; which Churches were nothing else but the believing and baptized
Rev. 22. 16. persons of each family, with such as they admitted and received into their
1 Thess. 1. 4. house to joyn in the worship of the same God.
1 Cor. 11. 16.
Rom. 16. 4.
1 Cor. 14. 23.

Thus Origen

for the most part speaks of the Church in the plural number αἱ ἐκκλησίαι.

col. 4. 15. Philem. 2. S. Chrysostom observeth of Priscilla and Aquila. Οὕτω δὲ ἵστα δοῦναι ὡς καὶ πᾶσι οἰκίαις ἐκκλησίαι
ποιῶσαι, διὰ τὸ πᾶσι ποιῶσαι πρὸς, καὶ διὰ τὸ τῆς ἐξουσίας αὐτῶν ἀνοξῆσαι πᾶσιν, Chrysost. Homil. 30. in Epist. ad Romanos.

Again, when the Scripture speaketh of any Countrey where the Gospel
* Gal. 1. 22. had been preached, it nameth always by way of plurality the * Chur-
Acts 9. 31. ches of that Countrey, as the Churches of Judaea, of Samaria and Ga-
1 Cor. 16. 1, lilee, the Churches of Syria and of Cilicia, the Churches of Galatia,
19. Rev. 1. 11. the Churches of Asia, the Churches of Macedonia. But notwithstan-
1 Thess. 2. 14. ding there were several such Churches or Congregations of Believers in
2 Cor. 8. 1. great and populous Cities, yet the Scriptures always speak of such Congre-
Gal. 1. 2. gations in the notion of one Church. As when S. Paul wrote to the Corin-
1 Cor. 14. 34. thians, * Let your women keep silence in the Churches, yet the dedication of his Epi-
1 Cor. 1. 7. stle is, Unto the Church of God which is at Corinth. So we reade not of the
† Acts 8. 1, 21, Churches, but the † Church at Jerusalem, the Church at Antioch, the Church
22. 13, 15, at Casarea, the Church at Ephesus, the Church of the Thessalonians, the Church
3. 18, 22. of Laodicea, the Church of Smyrna, the Church of Pergamus, the Church of
20. 17. Thyatira, the Church of Sardis, the Church of Philadelphia. From whence
2 Thess. 1. 1. it appeareth that a collection of several Congregations, every one of which
Col. 4. 16. is in some sense a Church, and may be called so, is properly one Church by
Rev. 3. 14. virtue of the subordination of them all in one government under one Ruler.
2. 8. 12. 18. For thus in those great and populous Cities where Christians were very nu-
3. 1, 7. And merous, not onely all the several Churches within the Cities, but those al-
thus after they so in the adjacent parts were united under the care and inspection of one
grew yet far Bishop, and therefore was accounted one Church; the number of the Chur-
more numerous ches following the number of the Angels, that is, the Rulers of them, as is evi-
in the time of dent in the Revelation.
Clemens Bi-
shop of Rome.
Ἡ Ἐκκλη-
σία τῶ Θεοῦ,
ἡ παροικῶσα
Ῥώμῃ τῇ
ἐκκλησίᾳ τῶ Θεοῦ παροικῶσα Κωνσταντίνου, Ep. 1. So after him Ignatius, Τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τῇ ἐξ ἡμῶν ἐν τῇ ἑσθλῇ ἐν Ἐπίσκόπῳ τῷ Ἀγίῳ
And Ἐκκλησίᾳ ἀγίᾳ τῇ ἐσθλῇ ἐν Τεσσαλονικίᾳ. And so the rest.

Now as several Churches are reduced to the denomination of one Church,
in relation to the single Governour of those many Churches, so all the
Churches of all Cities and all Nations in the world may be reduced to the
same single denomination in relation to one supreme Governour of them all,
and that one Governour is Christ the Bishop of our souls. Wherefore the A-
postle speaking of that in which all Churches do agree, comprehendeth them
all under the same appellation of one Church; and therefore often by the
name

name of *Church* are understood all Christians whatsoever belonging to any of the Churches dispersed through the distant and divided parts of the world. For the single persons professing faith in *Christ* are members of the particular Churches in which they live, and all those particular Churches are members of the General and Universal Church, which is one by unity of aggregation; and this is the Church in the Creed which we believe, and which is in other Creeds expressly termed † *One, I believe in one Holy Catholick Church.*

Charch Celsus calls the Christians, τὸν τοῦ μυσταίου ἐκκλησίαν, apud Orig. l. 5. Anacoreto, τὸν τοῦ οὐδοῦ εἰς μίαν ἀγίαν καθεστάντων ἁποστολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν. So the Jerusalem Creed in S. Cyril. Thus the Nicene with the additions of the Council of Constantinople, μίαν ἀγίαν καθεστάντων ἁποστολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν. Thus also the Alexandrian, as appeareth by those already quoted of Alexander, Arius and Eusebius.

† So the Creeds of Epiphanius in

It will therefore be farther necessary for the understanding of the nature of the Church which is thus one, to consider in what that Unity doth consist. And, being it is an aggregation not onely of many persons, but also of many congregations, the unity thereof must consist in some agreement of them all, and adhesion to something which is one. If then we reflect upon the first Church again, which we found constituted in the Acts, and to which all other since have been in a manner added and conjoyned, we may collect from their union and agreement how all other Churches are united and agree. Now they were described to be believing and baptized persons, converted to the faith by *S. Peter*, continuing stedfastly in the Apostles doctrine, and fellowship, and in breaking of bread and prayers. These then were all built upon the same Rock, all professed the same Faith, all received the same Sacraments, all performed the same devotions, and thereby were all reputed members of the same Church. To this Church were added daily such as should be saved, who became members of the same Church by being built upon the same foundation, by adhering to the same doctrine, by receiving the same Sacraments, by performing the same devotions.

From whence it appeareth that the first unity of the Church considered in it self, beside that of the head, which is one *Christ*, and the life communicated from that head, which is one Spirit, relieth upon the original of it, which is one; even as an house built upon one foundation, though consisting of many rooms, and every room of many stones, is not yet many, but one house. Now there is but one foundation upon which the Church is built, and that is *Christ*: *for other foundation can no man lay, then that is laid, which is Jesus Christ.* And though the Apostles and the Prophets be also termed the foundation, yet even then the unity is preserved, because as they are stones in the foundation, so are they united by one corner stone; whereby it comes to pass that such persons as are of the Church, being fellow citizens with the Saints, and of the household of God, are built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, *Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone, in whom all the building fitly framed together, groweth unto a holy Temple in the Lord.* This stone was laid in Zion for a foundation, a tried stone, a precious corner stone, a sure foundation; there was the first Church built, and whosoever have been, or ever shall be converted to the true Christian faith, are and shall be added to that Church, and laid upon the same foundation, which is the unity of † origination. Our Saviour gave the same power to all the Apostles, which was to found the Church; but he gave that power to *Peter*, to shew the unity of the same Church.

civitatem considerunt, à quibus traducem fidei & seipsam doctrinam ceteræ exinde Ecclesiæ mutuæ sunt, & quotidie mutuatur ut Ecclesiæ fiant: ac per hoc & ipsæ Apostolicæ, ut soboles Apostolicarum Ecclesiarum. Omne genus ad originem suam censetur necesse est. Itaque tot & tantæ Ecclesiæ una est illa ab Apostolis prima ex qua omnes. Sic omnes prima & Apostolicæ, dum una omnes probant unitatem: dum est illis communicatio pacis, & appellatio fraternitatis, & confederatio hospitalitatis:

tatis: quæ jura non alia ratio regit quam ejusdem Sacramenti una traditio. De Prescript. Hæret. c. 20. This is the Unitas originis which S. Cyprian so much insists upon, Ecclesia una est quæ in multitudinem latius incremento fecunditatis extenditur; quomodo Solis multi radii, sed lumen unum; & rami arboris multi, sed robur unum tenaci radice fundatum. Et cum de fonte uno rivuli plurimi defluunt, numerositas licet diffusa videatur exundantis copię largitate, unitas tamen servatur in origine, &c. S. Cyp. de Unitate Eccl. Loquitur Dominus ad Petrum, Ego tibi dico, inquit, quia tu es Petrus, & super istam petram edificabo Ecclesiam meam, &c. Et eidem post resurrectionem suam dicit, Pasce oves meas. Et quavis Apostolis omnibus post resurrectionem suam parem potestatem tribuat, & dicat, Sicut misit me Pater, & ego misso vos, &c. tamen ut unitatem manifestaret, unitatis ejusdem originem ab uno incipientem sua auctoritate disposuit. Hoc erant utique & ceteri Apostoli, quod fuit Petrus, pari consorcio præditi, & honoris & potestatis, sed exordium ab unitate proficiscitur, ut Ecclesia una monstretur. Ibid. Έως οτι ο Χρ̃στος, ὁ ἕως τῶ Κελσι, διὰ τὸ τοῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ πνεύματος καὶ τῶν ὁμώνυμων ἐκκλησιῶν, ἡλικυα διὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων, Clem. Alexand. Stromat. lib. 7. This is very much to be observed, because that place of S. Cyprian is produced by the Romanists to prove the necessity of one Head of the Church upon earth, and to shew that the Bishop of Rome is that one Head by virtue of his Succession to S. Peter, whereas S. Cyprian speaks of nothing of any such one Head, nor of any such succession, but only of the Origination of the Church, which was so disposed by Christ that the unity might be expressed. For whereas all the rest of the Apostles had equal power and honour with S. Peter, yet Christ did particularly give that power to S. Peter, to shew the unity of the Church which he intended to build upon the foundation of the Apostles.

Ephes. 4.5.
Fide 3.

Secondly, the Church is therefore one, though the members be many, because they all agree in one Faith. There is *one Lord, and one faith*, and that faith *once delivered to the Saints*, which whosoever shall receive, embrace and profess, must necessarily be accounted one in reference to that profession. For if a company of Believers become a Church by believing, they must also become one Church by believing one truth. If they be one in respect of the foundation, which is ultimately one, if we look upon *Christ*, which is mediately one, if we look upon the Apostles united in *one* corner-stone; if those which believe be therefore said to be built upon the foundation of the Apostles, because they believe the doctrine which the Apostles preached, and the Apostles be therefore said to be of the same foundation, and united to the corner-stone, because they all taught the same doctrine which they received from *Christ*, then they which believe the same doctrine delivered by *Christ* to all the Apostles, delivered by all the Apostles to Believers, being all professors of the same faith, must be members of the same Church. And this is the *†*Unity of Faith.

† Of this doth
Irenæus speak,
delivering the
summ or brief

ἀβραάμ of the material Object of Faith, Τὸ κήρυγμα παρεληφθῆς, καὶ τούτων ἡ πίστις ἡ Ἐκκλησία, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ κόσμῳ δι-
σπαρῶν ὁπμῶς ευλαδῶν, ὡς ἐὰν οἶκον εὐχέσῃ, καὶ ὁμοίως πισθεῖν τέτοις, ὡς μίαν ψυχὴν καὶ ἡ αὐτὴ ἔχουσα καρδίαν, καὶ σύμ-
φῶνως ταύτῃ κηρύσσῃ καὶ διδασκῇ, καὶ ἀποδίδωσιν ὡς ἐν στήμα καλῇ καὶ καλῇ, *Adu. Hæc. l. i. Κατὰ τὴν ὑπόστασιν, κατὰ τὴν ἐπι-
στοιαν, κατὰ τὴν ἀρχὴν, κατὰ τὴν ἐξουσίαν, μόνῃ τῇ αὐτῇ φαιδρὶ τῶν ἀρχαίων καὶ καθολικῶν Ἐκκλησιᾶν εἰς ἐνότητα πίστεως μίας*
καὶ ἡ τοῦτο ἰδίᾳ διδασκῶν, μάλλον δὲ καὶ τῶν διανοητῶν τῶν μίαν διδασκῶν τοῖς ῥητόροις, ἐνδὲς τῷ Θεῷ τῷ βυδνῶματι, δι' ἐνδὲς τῷ
Κυεὶ καὶ γένεσιν τοῦ ἡδὴ καταστεινωμένου, δι' ἀποφύσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ, δι' αὐτοῦ ἐπομένως ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κτισμῶν ἰγνώσας, Clem. Alex.
Stromat. l. 7. This unity of Faith followeth the unity of origination, because the true faith is the true foundation, Si quia est Ecclesia
quæ fidei refertur, hæc Apostolica prædicationis fundamenta possidet, deferenda est. Petra tuæ Christus est, S. Ambrosius in Luc.
lib. 2. cap. 9. Ἡ γὰρ Συνέχουσα τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ, ὡς φησιν ὁ Ποιμὴν, ἀρετὴ ἡ πίστις εἶναι, Clem. Alex. Stromat. lib. 2. S. Jerome in
those words of the Psalm. 23. 11. Hæc est generatio quærentium Dominum, hæc tibi observatio. Superius singulariter dixi,
Hic accipiet benedictionem; modo pluraliter, quia Ecclesia ex pluribus personis congregatur, & tamen una dicitur propter unita-
tatem fidei.

Matt. 28.19.
Ephes. 4.4.

EX COPY. NO. 17.

IC07.10.2,
3, 4.

Thirdly, many persons and Churches, howsoever distinguished by time or place, are considered as one Church, because they acknowledge and receive the same Sacraments, the signs and badges of the people of God. When the Apostles were sent to found and build the Church, they received this Commission, *Go and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.* Now as there is but *one Lord*, and *one faith*, so also is there but *one Baptism*; and consequently they which are admitted to it, in receiving it are one. Again, at the institution of the Lord's Supper, *Christ* commanded, saying, *Eat ye all of this, drink ye all of this*, and all by communicating of one, become as to that communication one. *For we being many are one bread, and one body; for we are all partakers of that one bread.* As therefore the *Israelites* were all baptized unto *Moses* in the cloud and in the sea, and did all eat the same spiritual meat, and did all drink the same spiritual drink, and thereby appeared to be the one people of God; so all believing persons,

and

and all Churches congregated in the name of *Christ*, washed in the same laver of Regeneration, eating of the same bread, and drinking of the same cup, are united in the same cognizance, and so known to be the same Church. And this is the Unity of the Sacraments.

Fourthly, whosoever belongeth to any Church is some way called, and all which are so, are called in one hope of their calling: the same reward of eternal life is promised unto every person, and we all through the Spirit wait for the hope of righteousness by faith. They therefore which depend upon the same God, and worship him all for the same end, the hope of Eternal life, which God that cannot lie, promised before the world began, having all the same expectation, may well be reputed the same Church. And this is the Unity of Hope.

Fifthly, they which are all of one mind, whatsoever the number of their persons be, they are in reference to that mind but one; as all the members howsoever different, yet being animated by one soul, become one body. Charity is of a fastning and uniting nature, nor can we call those many, who endeavour to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. By this, said our Saviour, shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another. And this is the † Unity of Charity.

Lastly, all the Churches of God are united into one by the unity of discipline and government, by virtue whereof the same *Christ* ruleth in them all. For they have all the same pastoral guides appointed, authorised, sanctified and set apart by the appointment of God, by the direction of the Spirit, to direct and lead the people of God in the same way of eternal salvation: as therefore there is * no Church where there is no Order, no Ministry; so where the same Order and Ministry is, there is the same Church. And this is the † Unity of Regiment and discipline.

* Ecclesia non est quæ non habet Sacerdotes. S. Hier. adv. Lucifer. Πάντες ἐνταμιθῶσιν τὸν Διακόνον ὡς Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, καὶ Ἐπίσκοπον ὡς Πατέρα, καὶ ὡς ἀρεσβυτέραν ὡς Κυβερνήτην Θεοῦ καὶ ὡς (ῥηιδεσμον Ἀποστόλων) καὶ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν καὶ καὶ ὡς Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν. Τὸ γὰρ ἡ Ἐκκλησία ὄνομα τῷ ἡμῶν Χριστῷ καὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων ὡς ἀρεσβυτέραν ὡς Κυβερνήτην Θεοῦ καὶ ὡς Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν. S. Cyril ad cap. 45. ubi interpretatur ὡς ἀρεσβυτέραν, male translulit declarat. quod est ὡς ἀρεσβυτέραν; cum reddere oportuerit, connectit, aut contextit. † Episcopatus unus est, cujus à singulis in solidum pars tenetur; Ecclesia una est quæ in multitudinem latius incremento fecunditatis extenditur, S. Cyr. ibidem. So he joys these two together, Cum sit à Christo una Ecclesia per totum mundum in multa membra divisa, item Episcopatus unus Episcoporum multorum concordie numerositate diffusus. Ep. ad Antonianum.

By these means and ** for these reasons, millions of persons, and multitudes of Congregations are united into one body, and become one Church. And thus under the name of *Church* expressed in this Article, I understand a body, or collection of humane persons professing faith in *Christ*, gathered together in several places of the world for the worship of the same God, and united into the same corporation by the means aforesaid. And this I conceive sufficient to declare the true notion of the Church as such, which is here the object of our Faith; it remaineth therefore that we next consider the existence of the Church; which is acknowledged in the act of Faith applied to this object. For when I profess and say, *I believe a Church*, it is not onely an acknowledgment of a Church which hath been, or of a Church which shall be, but also of that which is. When I say, *I believe in Christ dead*, I acknowledge that death which once was, and now is not: for *Christ* once died, but now is not dead. When I say, *I believe the resurrection of the body*, I acknowledge that which never yet was, and is not now, but shall hereafter be. Thus the act of Faith is applicated to the object according to the nature of it; to what is already past, as past, to what is to come, as still to come, to that which is present, as it is still present. Now that which was then past, when the Creed was made, must necessarily be alwayes past, and so believed for ever; that

Ephes. 4. 4.
Gal. 5. 5.

Ephes. 4. 3.
John 13. 35.

† Unus Deus enim & Christus unus, Ecclesia ejus una, fides una, & plebs in solidam corporis unitatem concordie glutino copulata, S. Cyr. de unitate Ec.

** These are all expressed by Tertullian, Una nobis & illis fides, unus Deus, idem Christus, eadem spes, eadem lavacri sacramenta; semel dixerim, una Ecclesia sumus, de Virg. veland. cap. 2. Corpus sumus de conscientia religionis, & disciplinæ unitate, & spei foedere, Apolog. cap. 39.

which shall never come to pass until the end of the world, when this publick profession of Faith shall cease, that must for ever be believed as still to come. But that which was when the Creed began, and was to continue till that Creed shall end, is proposed to our belief in every Age as being; and thus ever since the first Church was constituted, the Church it self, as being, was the object of the Faith of the Church believing.

The existence therefore of the Church of *Christ* (as that Church before is understood by us,) is the continuation of it in an actual being, from the first collection in the Apostles times unto the consummation of all things. And therefore to make good this explication of the Article, it will be necessary to prove that the Church which our Saviour founded and the Apostles gathered, was to receive a constant and perpetual accession, and by a successive augmentation be uninterruptedly continued in an actual existence of believing persons and congregations in all Ages unto the end of the world.

Now this indeed is a proper object of Faith, because it is grounded onely upon the promise of God; there can be no other assurance of the perpetuity of this Church, but what we have from him that built it. The Church is not of such a nature as would necessarily, once begun, preserve it self for ever. Many thousand persons have fallen totally and finally from the Faith professed, and so apostatized from the Church. Many particular Churches have been wholly lost, many Candlesticks have been removed; neither is there any particular Church which hath any power to continue it self more or longer then others; and consequently, if all particulars be defectible, the Universal Church must also be subject of it self unto the same defectibility.

But though the providence of God doth suffer many particular Churches to cease, yet the promise of the same God will never permit that all of them at once shall perish. When *Christ* spake first particularly to *S. Peter*, he sealed his speech with a powerful promise of perpetuity, saying, *Thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.* When he spake generally to all the rest of the Apostles, to the same purpose, *Goe teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;* he added a promise to the same effect, and loe I am with you alway, even to the end of the world. The first of these promises assureth us of the continuance of the Church, because it is built upon a rock; for our Saviour had expressed this before, *Whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doth them, I will liken him unto a wise man which built his house upon a rock, and the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew and beat upon that house, and it fell not, for it was founded upon a rock.* The Church of *Christ* is the house of *Christ*, for he hath builded the house, and is as a *Son over his own house*, whose house are we; and as a *wise man*, he hath built his house upon a rock, and what is so built shall not fall. The † latter of these promises giveth not onely an assurance of the continuance of the Church, but also the cause of that continuance, which is the presence of *Christ*. *Where two or three are gathered together in the name of Christ*, there he is in the *midst of them*, and thereby they become a Church, for they are as a builded house, and the Son within that house. Wherefore being *Christ* doth promise his presence unto the Church, even to the end of the world, he doth thereby assure us of the existence of the Church, until that time, of which his presence is the cause. Indeed, this is *the City of the Lord of hosts, the City of our God, God will establish it for ever*, as the great Prophet of the Church hath said.

† Non defecit Ecclesiam suam Divina protectio, dicente Domino, Ecce ego vobiscum omnibus diebus, &c. *Leo Ep. 31. S. Augustino* upon these words of the 101 Psal. *Exiguitatem dierum meorum annuntia mihi, maketh the Church to speak these words.* Quid est quod nescio qui recedentes à me murmurant contra me? Quid est quod perdit me perisse contendunt? Certe enim hoc dicunt, Quia fui & non sum. *Annuncio mihi exiguitatem dierum*

meorum. Non à te quero illos dies æternos; illi sine fine sunt, ubi ero, non ipsos quero; temporales quero, temporales dies mihi annuncia. *Exiguitatem dierum meorum,* non æternitatem dierum meorum *annuncia mihi.* Quamdiu ero in isto sæculo, annuncia mihi, propter illos qui dicunt. Fuit & jam non est: propter illos qui dicunt, Impletæ sunt Scripturæ, crediderunt omnes gentes, sed apostatavit & periit Ecclesia de omnibus gentibus. Quid est hoc, *Exiguitatem dierum meorum annuncia mihi?* Et annuntiavit, nec vacua fuit vox ista. Quis annuntiavit mihi nisi ipsa via? Quomodo annuntiavit? Ecce ego v. *biscum sum usque ad consummationem sæculi.* *Concione secunda in Psal. 101.* ^a *Psal. 48. 8.* Foræ ista Civitas, quæ mundum tenuit, aliquando everteretur. Abfit. *Deus fundavit eam in æternum.* Si ergo Deus fundavit eam in æternum, quid times ne cadat firmamentum? S. Aug. ad locum.

Upon the certainty of this truth, the existence of the Church hath been propounded as an object of our Faith in every Age of Christianity; and so it shall be still unto the end of the world. For those which are Believers are the Church: and therefore if they do believe, they must believe there is a Church. And thus having shewed in what the nature of a Church consisteth, and proved that a Church of that nature is of perpetual and indefectible existence, by virtue of the promises of *Christ*, I have done all which can be necessary for the explication of this part of the Article, *I believe the Church.*

After the consideration of that which is the subject in this Article, followeth the explication of the affections thereof; which are two, Sanctity and Universality; the one attributed unto it by the Apostles, the other by the Fathers of the Church: by the first the Church is denominated *Holy*, by the second *Catholic*. Now the Church which we have described, may be called holy in several respects, and for several reasons; First, in reference to the Vocation by which all the members thereof called, and separated from the rest of the world to God; which separation in the language of the Scriptures is a sanctification: and so the calling being holy, (for *God hath called us with an holy calling,*) the body which is separated and congregated thereby, may well be termed *holy*. Secondly, in relation to the offices appointed, and the powers exercised in the Church, which by their institution and operation are holy, that Church for which they were appointed, and in which they are exercised, may be called *holy*. Thirdly, because whosoever is called to profess Faith in *Christ*, is thereby engaged to holiness of life, according to the words of the Apostle, *Let every one that nameth the name of Christ, depart from iniquity:* for those namers of the name or named by the name of *Christ*, are such as called on his name, and that was the description of the Church; as when *Saul* did persecute the Church, it is said he had *authority from the chief Priests to bind all that called upon the name of Christ*, and when he preached *Christ* in the Synagogues, all that heard him said, *Is not this he who destroyed them which called on his name in Jerusalem?* Being then all within the Church are by their profession obliged to such holiness of life, in respect of this obligation, the whole Church may be termed *holy*. Fourthly, in regard the end of constituting a Church in God, was for the purchasing an holy and a precious people; and the great design thereof was for the begetting and encreasing holiness, that as God is originally holy in himself, so he might communicate his sanctity to the sons of men, whom he intended to bring unto the fruition of himself, unto which without a previous sanctification they can never approach, because *without holiness no man shall ever see God.*

For these four reasons the whole Church of God, as it containeth in it all the persons which were called to the profession of the Faith of *Christ*, or were baptized in his name, may well be termed and believed *holy*. But the Apostle hath delivered another kind of holiness which cannot belong unto the Church taken in so great a latitude. For, saith he, *Christ loved the Church, and gave himself for it, that he might sanctify and cleanse it by the washing of water by the word, that he might present it to himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing, but that it should be holy and without blemish.*

Now

2 Tim. 1. 9.

2 Tim. 2. 19.

Act. 9. 14. 21.
vide 1 Cor. 1. 2
"Οτι οὗτος
ἔσθ' ὁ καταστρέφων
τοὺς καλοῦντες
τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ
κυρίου ἡμῶν
Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ
ἐν τῇ Ἱερουσαλὴμ.
Ἰδὲ. Πελεξ.
Epist. 246. 1. 2.

Ephes. 5. 25,
26, 27.

Now though it may be conceived that *Christ* did love the whole Church as it did any way contain all such as ever called upon his name, and did give himself for all of them : yet we cannot imagine that the whole body of all men could ever be so holy, as to be without spot, wrinkle, blemish, or any such thing. It will be therefore necessary, within the great complex body of the Universal Church, to find that Church to which this absolute holiness doth belong : and to this purpose it will be fit to consider both the difference of the persons contained in the Church, as it hath been hitherto described, while they continue in this life, and their different conditions after death ; whereby we shall at last discover in what persons this holiness is inherent really, in what condition it is inherent perfectly, and consequently in what other sense it may be truly and properly affirmed that the Church is *holy*.

Where first we must observe that the Church, as it embraceth all the professors of the true Faith of *Christ*, containeth in it not onely such as do truly believe and are obedient to the word, but those also which are hypocrites, and prophane. Many profess the Faith, which have no true belief : many have some kind of Faith, which live with no correspondence to the Gospel preached. Within therefore the notion of the Church are comprehended good and bad, being both externally called, and both professing the same Faith. For the Kingdom of heaven is like unto a field in which wheat and tares grow together into the harvest ; like unto a net that was cast into the sea, and gathered of every kind ; like unto a floore in which is laid up wheat and chaff ; like unto a marriage feast, in which some have on the wedding garment, and some not. This is that Ark of Noah in which were preserved beasts clean, and unclean. This is that great house in which there are not onely vessels of gold and of silver, but also of wood, and of earth, and some to honour and some to dishonour. There are many called, of all which the Church consisteth, but there are few chosen, of those which are called, and thereby within the Church. I conclude therefore, as the ancient Catholicks did against the † Donatists, that within the Church, in the publick profession and external communion thereof, are contained persons truly good and sanctified, and hereafter saved ; and together with them other persons void of all saving grace, and hereafter to be damned : and that Church containing these of both kinds may well be called *holy*, as S. Matthew called *Jerusalem the Holy City*, even at that time when our Saviour did but begin to preach, when we know there was in that City a general Corruption in manners and worship.

Mat. 13. 24.
30, 47.

Mat. 3. 12.

Firmissime
tene & nul-
latus dubi-
tes aream
Dei esse Ec-
clesiam Ca-
tholicam, &
intra eam u-
que in finem
saeculi fru-
mento mixtas
paleas conti-
neri, hoc est,
bonis malos
sacramento-
rum commu-
nione misce-
ri, Fulgent.
ad Petrum,

cap. 43. Mat. 22. 10. 2 Tim. 2. 20. S. Jerome joins these two together, Arca Noe Ecclesiae typus : ut in illa omnium animalium genera, ita & in hac universarum & gentium & morum homines sunt, ut ubi pardus & hircus, lupus & agni, ita & hic iusti & peccatores, id est, vasa aurea & argentea cum ligneis & fictilibus commorantur, Dialog. contra Luciferianos. † The Opinion of the Donatists confuted by the Catholicks is to be seen in S. Augustine's book intitled Breviculus Collationum. upon which reflecting in his Book Post Collationem, he observes how they were forced by the testimony of those Scriptures which we have produced to acknowledge that there were mingled with the good such as were occultly bad, Ecce etiam ipsi veritate Evangelica non aliud coacti sunt confiteri quam malos occultos nunc ei permixtos esse, as the good and bad fish are taken in the same net, because it could not discern the bad from the good. And from thence he inforceth from their acknowledgment, that those which are apparently evil, are contained in the same Church. Si enim propterea retibus bonos & malos congregantibus Ecclesiam comparavit, quia malos in Ecclesia non manifestos sed latentes intelligi voluit, quos ita nesciunt sacerdotes, quemadmodum sub fluctibus quid acceperint retia nesciunt Piscatores. Propterea ergo & arca comparata est, ut etiam manifeste mali cum bonis in ea praenuntiarentur futuri. Neque enim palea quae in arca est permixta frumentis, etiam ipsa sub fluctibus lateret, quae sic omnium oculis est conspicua, ut potius occulta sint in ea frumenta, cum sit ipsa manifesta, Lib. post Collat. cap. 9, 10.

Of these promiscuously contained in the Church, such as are void of all saving grace while they live, and communicate with the rest of the Church, and when they pass out of this life, die in their sins, and remain under the eternal wrath of God ; as they were not in their persons holy while they lived, so are they no way of the Church after their death, neither as members of it, nor as contained in it. Through their own demerit they fall short of the glory unto

unto which they were called, and being by death separated from the external Communion of the Church, and having no true internal communion with the members and the head thereof, are totally and finally cut off from the Church of *Christ*. On the contrary, such as are efficaciously called, justified, and sanctified, while they live are truly holy, and when they die are perfectly holy; nor are they by their death separated from the Church, but remain united still by virtue of that internal union by which they were before conjoined both to the members and the head. As therefore the Church is truly holy, not onely by an holiness of institution, but also by a personal sanctity in reference to these Saints while they live, so is it also perfectly holy, in relation to the same Saints glorified in heaven. And at the end of the world, when all the wicked shall be turned into hell, and consequently all cut off from the communion of the Church; when the members of the Church remaining being perfectly sanctified, shall be eternally glorified, then shall the whole Church be truly and perfectly *holy*.

Then shall that be compleatly fulfilled, that *Christ* shall present unto himself a glorious Church, which shall be holy and without blemish. Not that there are two Churches of *Christ*, one in which good and bad are mingled together, another in which there are good alone; one in which the Saints are imperfectly holy, another in which they are perfectly such; but one and the same Church in relation to † different times, admitteth or not admitteth the permixtion of the wicked, or the imperfection of the godly. To conclude, the Church of God is universally holy in respect of all, by institutions and administrations of sanctity; the same Church is really holy in this world, in relation to all godly persons contained in it, by a real infused sanctity; the same is farther yet at the same time perfectly holy in reference to the Saints departed and admitted to the presence of God; and the same Church shall hereafter be most compleatly holy in the world to come, when all the members actually belonging to it, shall be at once perfected in holiness and compleated in happiness. And thus I conceive the affection of sanctity sufficiently explicated.

Ephes. 2. 27.

† This was it which the Catholics answered to the Donatists, objecting that they made two distinct Churches. De duabus etiam ecclesiis calumniam eorum Catholicici refutarunt identidem expresse.

sius ostendentes quid dixerint, id est, non eam Ecclesiam quæ nunc habet permixtos malos alienam se dixisse à regno Dei, ubi non erunt mali commixti, sed eandem ipsam unam & sanctam Ecclesiam nunc esse aliter, tunc autem aliter futuram, nunc habere malos mixtos, tunc non habituram, sicut nunc mortalem quod ex mortalibus constaret hominibus, tunc autem immortalem, quod in ea nullus esset vel corpore moriturus, sicut non ideo duo Christi, quia prior mortuus postea non moriturus, S. Aug. *Collat. 3. diu.*

The next affection of the Church is that of Universality, *I believe the holy CATHOLICK Church*. Now the word *Catholic*, as it is not read in the Scriptures, so was it not anciently in the Creed (as we have already shewn) but being inserted by the Church, must necessarily be interpreted by the sense which the most ancient Fathers had of it, and that sense must be confirmed, so far as it is consentient with the Scriptures. To grant then that the word was not used by the . . Apostles, we must also acknowledge that it was most anciently in use among the Primitive Fathers, and that as to several intents. For first, they called the Epistles of S. James, S. Peter, S. John, S. Jude, the . . Catholic Epistles, because when the Epistles written by S. Paul were directed to particular Churches congregated in particular Cities, these were either sent to the Churches dispersed through a great part of the world, or directed to the whole Church of God upon the face of the whole earth. Again, we observe the Fathers to use the word *Catholic* for nothing

. . It was the ordinary objection of the Schismatical Novatians, that the very name of Catholics was never used by the Apostles, and the answer to it by

the Catholics was by way of concession. Sed sub Apostolis, inquit, nemo Catholicus vocabatur; Esto, sic fuerit, vel illud indulge, &c. Pacianus ad Sympronianum, Epist. 1. . . So S. Jerome of S. James. Unam tantum scripsit Epistolam quæ de septem Catholicis est: of S. Peter, Scripsit duas Epistolas quæ Catholicæ nominantur: of S. Jude, Judas frater Jacobi, parvam

Although this seem the first intention of those which gave the name *Catholick* to the Church, to signifie thereby nothing else but the whole or universal Church, yet those which followed did signifie by the same that affection of the Church which floweth from the nature of it, and may be expressed by that word. At first they called the whole Church *Catholick*, meaning no more then the Universal Church; but having used that term some space of time, they considered how the nature of the Church was to be Universal, and in what that Universality did consist.

As far then as the ancient Fathers have expressed themselves, and as far as their expressions are agreeable with the descriptions of the Church delivered in the Scriptures, so far I conceive we may safely conclude that the Church of *Christ* is truly *Catholick*, and that the truly *Catholick* Church is the true Church of *Christ*, which must necessarily be sufficient for the explication of this affection, which we acknowledge when we say, we *believe the Catholick Church*.

The most obvious and most general notion of this Catholicism consisteth in the diffusiveness of the Church, grounded upon the Commission given to the builders of it, *Go teach all nations*, whereby they and their successors were authorized and impowered to gather Congregations of Believers, and so to extend the borders of the Church unto the utmost parts of the earth. The Synagogue of the *Jews* especially consisted of one nation, and the publick worship of God was confined to one Countrey, *In Judah was God known, and his name was great in Israel; in Salom was his Tabernacle, and his dwelling place in Sion. He shewed his word unto Jacob, his statutes and his judgments unto Israel; he hath not dealt so with any nation.* The Temple was the onely place in which the Sacrifices could be offered, in which the Priests could perform their office of ministration; and so under the law there was an inclosure divided from all the world beside. But God said unto his Son, *I will give the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession.* And *Christ* commanded the Apostles, saying, *Goe ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature; that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations beginning at Jerusalem.* Thus the Church of *Christ*, in its primary institution, was made to be of a diffusive nature, to spread and extend it self, from the City of *Jerusalem*, where it first began, to all the parts and corners of the earth. From whence we find them in the Revelation, crying to the Lamb, *Thou wast slain and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood, out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation.* This reason did the ancient Fathers render why the Church was called * *Catholick*, and the nature of the Church is so described in the Scriptures.

* we have before observed of Arius and Euzoius, that

naming the *Catholick* Church in their Creed, they gave withall the interpretation of it. Εἰς μίαν καθολικὴν Ἐκκλησίαν ᾧ Θεῷ, ἡμῶν καὶ μέγαν ἑαυτοῦ. S. Cyril of Jerusalem gives this as the first importance of the word. καθολικὴ ἢ ὅτι καὶ ὅλην διατρεφείτωσαν. ἡ δὲ οὐκ ἐκείνη καὶ μέγαν ἡμῶν καὶ μέγαν, *Catech.* 18. Ubi ergo erit proprietates Catholicici nominis, cum inde dicta sit Catholica, quod sit rationalis & ubique diffusa? Optatus l. 2. Ipsa est enim Ecclesia Catholica: unde καθολικὴ Græce appellatur, quod per totum orbem diffunditur, S. Aug. *Epist.* 170. Ecclesia illa est quam modo dixi unicam suam, hæc est unica Catholica quæ toto orbe copiose diffunditur, quæ usque ad ultimas gentes crescendo porrigitur, *Idem Epist.* 30. Si autem dubitas quod Ecclesiam quæ per omnes gentes numerositate copiosa dilaturatur, S. Scriptura commendat, multis & manifestissimis testimoniis ex eadem autoritate prolatis te onerabo, *Idem contra Crescon.* l. 1. c. 33. Sancta Ecclesia ideo dicitur Catholica, pro eo quod universaliter per omnem mundum sit diffusa, *Isidor. de Summo Bono, lib. 1. cap. 9.*

Secondly, they called the Church of *Christ* the *Catholick* Church, because it teacheth all things which are necessary for a Christian to know, whether they be things in heaven or things in earth, whether they concern the condition of man in this life, or in the life to come. As the Holy Ghost did lead the Apostles *into all truth*, so did the Apostles leave all truth unto the Church, which teach-

so none shall ever escape the eternal wrath of God, which belong not to the Church of God. This is the Congregation of those persons here on earth which shall hereafter meet in heaven. These are the Vessels of the Tabernacle carried up and down, at last to be translated into, and fixed in, the Temple.

Secondly, it is necessary to believe the Church of *Christ* which is but one, that being in it we may take care never to cast our selves, or be ejected, out of it. There is a power within the Church to cast those out which do belong to it; for if any neglect to hear the Church, saith our Saviour, *let him be unto thee as an heathen man, and a Publican.* By great and scandalous offences, by incorrigible misdemeanours, we may incur the censure of the Church of God, and while we are shut out by them, we stand excluded out of heaven. For our Saviour said to his Apostles, upon whom he built his Church, *Whosoever sins ye remit they are remitted unto them, and whosoever sins ye retain they are retained.* Again, a man may not onely passively and involuntarily be rejected, but also may by an act of his own, cast out or reject himself, not onely by plain and complete Apostacy, but by a defection from the unity of truth, falling into some damnable Heresie, or by an active separation, deserting all which are in communion with the Catholick Church, and falling into an irrecoverable Schism.

Thirdly, it is necessary to believe the Church of *Christ* to be holy, lest we should presume to obtain any happiness by being of it, without that holiness which is required in it. It is not enough that the end, institution and administration of the Church are holy: but, that there may be some real and permanent advantage received by it, it is necessary that the persons abiding in the communion of it should be really and effectually sanctified. Without which holiness the priviledges of the Church prove the greatest disadvantages, and the means of salvation neglected, tend to a punishment with aggravation. It is not onely vain but pernicious to attend at the marriage-feast without a wedding garment, and it is our Saviour's description of folly to cry, *Lord, Lord, open unto us*, while we are without oyl in our lamps. We must acknowledge a necessity of holiness, when we confess that Church alone which is holy can make us happy.

Sola Catholica Ecclesia est quæ verum cultum retinet. Hic est fons veritatis, hoc est domicilium fidei, hoc templum Dei: quo si quis non intraverit, vel à quo si quis exierit, à spe vitæ ac salutis æternæ alienus est. *Lactant.* l. 4. c. 30.

Fourthly, there is a necessity of believing the Catholick Church, because except a man be of that he can be of none. For being the Church which is truly Catholick containeth within it all which are truly Churches, whosoever is not of the Catholick Church, cannot be of the true Church. That Church alone which first began at *Jerusalem* on earth, will bring us to the *Jerusalem* in heaven; and that alone began there which always embraceth the faith once delivered to the Saints. Whatsoever Church pretendeth to a new beginning, pretendeth at the same time to a new Churchdome, and whatsoever is so new is none. So necessary it is to believe the *holy Catholick Church.*

Having thus far explicated the first part of this Article, I conceive every person sufficiently furnished with means of instruction, what they ought to intend, when they profess to believe the *holy Catholick Church.* For thereby every one is understood to declare thus much; I am fully perswaded, and make a free confession of this, as of a necessary and infallible truth, that *Christ* by the preaching of the Apostles, did gather unto himself a Church consisting of thousands of believing persons, and numerous Congregations, to which he daily added such as should be saved, and will successively and daily add unto the same unto the end of the world: so that by the virtue of his all-sufficient promise, I am assured that there was, hath been hitherto, and now

now is, and hereafter shall be so long as the Sun and Moon endure, a Church of *Christ* one and the same. This Church I believe in general holy in respect of the Author, end, institution and administration of it; particularly in the members, here I acknowledge it really, and in the same hereafter perfectly, holy. I look upon this Church not like that of the *Jews* limited to one people, confined to one nation, but by the appointment and command of *Christ*, and by the efficacy of his assisting power, to be disseminated through all nations, to be extended to all places, to be propagated to all ages, to contain in it all truths necessary to be known, to exact absolute obedience from all men to the commands of *Christ*, and to furnish us with all graces necessary to make our persons acceptable, and our actions well-pleasing in the sight of God. And thus I believe the holy Catholick Church.

The Communion of Saints.

THis part of the Article beareth something a † later date than any of the rest, but yet is no way inferiour to the other in relation to the certainty of the truth thereof. And the late admission of it into the Creed will be thus far advantageous, that thereby we may be the better assured of the true intent of it, as it is placed in the Creed. For it will be no way fit to give any other explication of these words as the sense of the Creed, then what was then understood by the Church of God, when they were first inserted.

† These words Communio-nem Sanctorum, were not in the Aquileian Creed expounded by Ruffinus; they were not mentioned by him, as being either

in the Oriental or the Roman Creed. They were not in the African Creed expounded by S. Austin De Fide & Symbolo; nor in the Creed delivered by Maximus Taurinensis; nor in any of the Sermons of Chrysologus; nor in any of the four Books de Symbolo ad Catechamenos attributed to S. Austin; nor in the 119. Sermon under his name De Tempore, Cum dixerimus Sanctam Ecclesiam, adjungamus Remissionem peccatorum. They are not in the Greek Creed in Sir Robert Cotton's Library, nor in the old Latine Creed in the Oxford Library, nor in that produced by Elipandus. We find them not in the old Greek Creeds, not in that of Eusebius given in to the Council of Nice; nor in that of Marcellus delivered to the Bishop of Rome, nor in that of Arius and Eusebius presented to Constantine, nor in either of the Creeds preserved in the Anacrotus of Epiphanius, nor in the Jerusalem Creed expounded by S. Cyril, nor in that of the Council of Constantinople, nor in that of Chrysostom given in to the Ephesine Council, nor in either of the Expositions under the name of S. Chrysostome. It was therefore of a later date, and is found in the Latine and Greek Copy in Bennet College Library, and is expressed and expounded in the 115. and 181. Sermon de Tempore, attributed to S. Austin. v. Paschalis Symbolum.

If we look upon the first institution of the Church, and the original condition of those persons which received the Gospel, how they were all together, *Act. 2. 44, 45.* and had all things common; how they sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all men as every man had need, how S. Paul urged an equality, that the abundance of some might supply the want of others, as it was written, He that had gathered much had nothing over, and he that had gathered little had no lack: we might well conceive that the communion, (which word might be taken for communication) of the Saints, may signify the great * charity, bounty and community, among the people of God. *2 Cor. 8. 14, 15.*

But being that community precisely taken, was not of eternal obligation, nor actually long continued in the Church; being I conceive this Article doth not wholly look upon that which is already past; and especially, being I think neither that custom, nor that notion was then generally received in the Church, when this communion of Saints was first inserted, I shall therefore endeavour to shew that communion which is attributed to the Saints both according to the Fathers who have delivered it, and according to the Scriptures from whence they derived it.

Now all communion being between such as are some way different and distinct, the communion of the Saints may either be conceived between them and others, or between themselves; between them and others as differing from them either in their nature or their sanctity, between themselves, as distinct

* Grotius upon that place of the Corinthians observes, Spectat & huc ea quam in Symbolo profitemur Sanctorum communionem.

stinct in person onely, or condition also. Wherefore if we can first understand who, or what kind of persons these are which are called *Saints*, with whom beside themselves, and how among themselves, in this relation as they are the *Saints*, they have communion, and lastly in what the nature of that *Communion* in each respect consisteth; I know not what can be thought wanting to the perfect explication of the *Communion of Saints*.

That we may understand what Communion the Saints have with others, it would be necessary first to consider what it is to be a *Saint*, in what the true nature of *Saintship* doth consist, by what the *Saints* are distinguished from others. Again, that we may understand what *Communion the Saints* have with or among themselves, it will be farther necessary to consider who are those persons to which that title doth belong, what are the various conditions of them, that we may be able to comprehend all such as are true *Saints*, and thence conclude the *communion* between them all.

I take it first for granted, that though the Greek word which we translate *Saints*, be in it self as applicable to † things, as persons; yet in this Article it signifieth not holy things, but *holy ones*, that is, persons holy. Secondly, I take it also for granted, that the singular Holy one, the Holy one of *Israel*, the Fountain of all sanctity, the sanctifier of all Saints, is not comprehended in the Article, though the communion of the holy ones with that singular, eminent, and transcendent * Holy one, be contained in it. Thirdly, I take it farther for granted that the word in this Article which we translate *Saints* is not taken in the Original of the Creed, as it is often taken in the Translation of the Old Testament, for the † *Sanctuary*, as if the communion were nothing else but a right of communicating or participating of the holy things of God. Lastly, I take it also for granted that although the blessed and holy Angels are sometimes called in the Scriptures by the name of * *Saints*, yet they are not those Saints who are here said to have the communion, though the Saints have communion with them.

† Κοινωνία
ἀγίων may be
as well under-
stood in the
Newer as the
Masculine, as
Exod. 28. 38.
Ἐξαρτᾷ Ἀα-
ρὸν τὰ ἀγία
θημιά, that
Aaron may
bear the ini-
quity of the
holy things.
So Levit. 5. 15
καὶ ἀμαρτη-
σάτωσιν σου
τῶν ἁγίων
Κυρίου. 22. 2.
καὶ συνε-
τάσω σου τῶν ἁγίων
τῶν ἁγίων. 1 Chron. 24. 5. ἀρχιερεὶς τῶν ἁγίων, the Governours of the Sanctuary, of which notion afterwards.

* This is one of the common names of God in the Old Testament, קדוש ישראל, Ἱερόν. which is also sometimes translated plurally by the LXX. as Esa. 41. 16. בקדוש ישראל, ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις Ἱερόν. Jer. 51. 5. מקדוש ישראל, ἁγίων Ἱερόν. and if it were so taken, then κοινωνία τῶν ἁγίων, would be the communion of God, as τὸ ἁγίον Πνεῦμα. † Τα ἁγία is frequently used in the Scriptures for the Sanctuary; and then κοινωνία τῶν ἁγίων might be taken for the communion in all those things which belonged to the worship of God, as ἀκοινωνήτης was a man excluded from all such communion. * The Angels are not onely called holy in the Scriptures by way of addition or epithite, as πάντες οἱ ἄγγελοι, Matt. 25. 31. καὶ τῶν ἁγίων τῶν ἁγίων, Mark 8. 38. Luke 9. 26. ἐξουσιασμένοι ἐπὶ ἁγίων, Acts 10. 22. ἐννομοὶ τῶν ἁγίων ἀγγέλων, Rev. 14. 10. But also the ἄγγελοι, holy ones, or Saints taken substantively or singly signify sometimes the Angels, as Deut. 22. 2. קדוש מרבבת ואותה he came with ten thousands of Saints, which the Jerusalem Targum renders ועמיה רבבין קדושין and with him ten thousands of holy Angels; and Jonathan, ועמיה רבבין קדושין and with him myriads of myriads of holy Angels. And although the LXX keep the Hebrew קדוש, yet they understood the Angels in that place ὡς μετὰ καὶ αὐτοῦ, [Hesych. καὶ αὐτοῦ ἀμαρτωλῶν] ἐν δὲ ξιῶν αὐτῶν ἀγγελοι μετ' αὐτοῦ. So Job 5. 1. To which of the Saints wilt thou turn? εἰ πῦρ ἀγγέλων ἀγίων ὁ-ψ, LXX. Thus in the vision of Daniel, he heard one Saint speaking, and another Saint said unto that certain Saint which spake, Dan. 8. 13. So Zach. 14. 5. And the Lord my God shall come, and all the Saints with thee. And thus it may very well be understood in the New Testament 1 Thess. 3. 13. ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ πάντων τῶν ἁγίων αὐτοῦ, in correspondence to that 2 Thess. 1. 17. ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ αὐτῶν μετ' ἀγγέλων διδουμένων αὐτοῦ. These are the μυριάδες ἀγίων in S. Jude קדוש מרבבת the myriads of Angels; and thus κοινωνία ἀγίων should be the communion of the Angels.

For this part of the Article hath a manifest relation to the former, in which we profess to believe the *Holy Church*; which Church is therefore holy because those persons are such, or ought to be, which are within it, the Church it self being nothing but a Collection of such persons. To that Confession is added this Communion; but because though the Church be holy, yet every person contained in it is not truly so, therefore is added this part of the Article which concerneth those who are truly such. There is therefore no doubt but the *Saints* mentioned here, are members of the Church of *Christ*, as we have described it, built upon the Apostles, laid upon the foundation of their doctrine,

doctrine, who do not onely profess the Gospel, but also are sanctified thereby.

The onely question then remaining is, in what their sanctity or Saintship doth consist, and, (because though they which are Believers since our Saviour's death be truly and more highly sanctified, yet such as lived before and under the Law, the Patriarchs, the Prophets and the servants of God were so called, and were truly named the Saints of God) who were the persons which are capable of that denomination.

Now being God himself hath given a rule unto his people, which is both in the nature of a precept and of a pattern: (*Be ye holy as I the Lord your God am holy: be ye holy*, there's the command, *as the Lord your God is holy*, there's the rule;) being it is impossible that we should have the same sanctity which is in God, it will be necessary to declare what is this holiness which maketh men to be accounted holy ones, and to be called *Saints*.

The true notion of *Saints* is expressed by *Moses* both as to the subject, and the affection or qualification of it; for they are called by him *men of holiness*; such are the persons understood in this Article, which is the communion of men of holiness. Now Holiness in the first acception of it signifieth Separation, and that with the relation of a double term, of one from which the separation is made, of the other to which that which is separated is applied. Those things which were counted holy under the Law were separated from common use, and applied to the service of God, and their sanctity was nothing else but that separation from and to those terms, from an use and exercise profane and common, to an use and exercise peculiar and divine. Thus all such persons as are called from the vulgar and common condition of the world unto any peculiar service or relation unto God, are thereby denominated holy, and in some sense receive the name of *Saints*. The Pen-men of the Old Testament do often speak of the people of *Israel* as of an holy nation, and God doth speak unto them as to people holy unto himself; because he had chosen them out of all the nations of the world and appropriated them to himself. Although therefore most of that nation were rebellious to him which called them, and void of all true inherent and actual sanctity, yet because they were all in that manner separated, they were all, as to the separation, called holy. In the like manner those of the New Testament writing to such as were called, and had received, and were baptized, in the faith, give unto them all the name of *Saints*, as being in some manner such, by being called and baptized. For being baptism is a washing away of sin, and the purification from sin is a proper sanctification; being every one who is so called and baptized is thereby separated from the rest of the world which are not so, and all such separation is some kind of sanctification; being though the work of grace be not perfectly wrought, yet when the means are used, without something appearing to the contrary, we ought to presume of the good effect, therefore all such as have been received into the Church, may be in some sense called holy.

But because there is more then an outward vocation, and a charitable presumption, necessary to make a man holy; therefore we must find some other qualification which must make him really and truly such, not onely by an extrinsecal denomination, but by a real and internal affection. What this sanctity is, and who are capable of this title properly, we must learn out of the Gospel of *Christ*, by which alone, ever since the Church of *Christ* was founded, any man can become a Saint. Now by the tenure of the Gospel we shall find that those are truly and properly *Saints*, which are sanctified in *Christ Jesus*; first, in respect of their holy faith, by which they are regenerated; for *whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ, is born of God*; by which they are purged, God himself purifying their hearts by

Exod. 22.31.
אנשי קדש

1 Cor. 1.2.

1 John 5.1.

Acts 15.9.

Z z

faith;

¹ Cor. 6. 11. *faith, whereby they are washed, sanctified, and justified in the name of the Lord*
 Ephes. 1. 13. *Jesus, in whom also after that they believe, they are sealed with the holy Spirit of*
² Pet. 1. 15. *promise; secondly, in respect of their conversation: For as he which hath cal-*
² Pet. 1. 8. *led them is holy, so are they holy in all manner of conversation; adding to their*
faith virtue, and to virtue knowledge, and to knowledge temperance, and to tempe-
rance patience, and to patience brotherly kindnes, and to brotherly kindnes charity,
that they may neither be barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus
Christ. Such persons then as are called by a holy calling, and not disobedient
to it, such as are endued with a holy faith, and purified thereby, such as
are sanctified by the holy Spirit of God, and by virtue thereof do lead a holy
life, perfecting holiness in the fear of God, such persons, I say, are really and truly
Saints, and being of the Church of Christ, (as all such now must of necessity
be) are the proper subject of this part of the Article, the communion of Saints,
as it is added to the former, the holy Catholick Church.

Now as these are the Saints of the Church of *Christ*, from whence they were called *the Churches of the Saints*: so there was never any Church of God but there were such persons in it as were Saints; we reade in the *Psalms* of the congregation and the assembly of the Saints; and *Moses* assured the people of *Israel*, that all the Saints of God were in his hand; we reade in the Prophets of ^a the Saints of the most High, and at our Saviour's death the bodies of such Saints which slept arose. Where again we may observe that they were Saints while their bodies were in the grave; as *Aaron* in the time of *David* kept the name of Saint of the Lord. Such as are holy in their lives do not lose their sanctity but improve it at their deaths, nor can they lose the honour of that appellation, while that which gives it doth acquire perfection.

Hence grows that necessary distinction of the Saints on earth, and the Saints in heaven; the first belonging to the Militant, the second to the Triumphant Church. Of the first the Prophet *David* speaketh expressly, ^b *Thou art my Lord, my goodness extendeth not to thee, but to the Saints that are in the earth*: of these do we reade in the Acts of the Apostles, to these did *S. Paul* direct his Epistles. Of the second doth the Apostle make that question, ^c *Do ye not know that the Saints shall judge the world?* And all those which were spoken of as Saints then in earth, if truly such and departed so, are now, and shall for ever continue, Saints in heaven.

Having thus declared what is the sanctity required to make a Saint, that is, a man of holiness; having also distinguished the Saints before, and under the Gospel, (which difference is onely observable as to this exposition of the Creed,) and again distinguishing the same Saints while they live here with men on earth, and when after death they live with God in heaven; having also shewed that of all these, those Saints are here particularly understood who in all ages lived in the Church of *Christ*; we may now properly descend to the next consideration, which is, who are those persons with whom those Saints have this Communion, and in what the Communion which they have consists.

First then the Saints of God living in the Church of *Christ*, have communion with God the Father; for the Apostles did therefore write that they to whom they wrote might have communion with them, (*that which we have seen and heard declare we unto you, that ye also may have fellowship with us, saith S. John,*) and did at the same time declare that their communion was with the Father. Wherefore being all the Saints of God under the Gospel receiving the doctrine of the Apostles have communion with them; being the communion of the Apostles was the communion with the Father, it followeth that all the Saints of God under the Gospel have a communion with God the Father. As we are the branches of the Vine, so the Father is the husbandman; and thus the Saints partake

¹ Cor. 14. 33.

Psal. 89. 57.

149. קדש

קדש

LXX. ἐν

ἐν τῇ

ἐν τῇ

ἐν τῇ

ἐν τῇ

ἐν τῇ

ἐν τῇ

ἐν τῇ

ἐν τῇ

ἐν τῇ

ἐν τῇ

ἐν τῇ

ἐν τῇ

ἐν τῇ

ἐν τῇ

ἐν τῇ

ἐν τῇ

ἐν τῇ

ἐν τῇ

ἐν τῇ

ἐν τῇ

ἐν τῇ

ἐν τῇ

ἐν τῇ

ἐν τῇ

ἐν τῇ

ἐν τῇ

ἐν τῇ

ἐν τῇ

ἐν τῇ

ἐν τῇ

ἐν τῇ

ἐν τῇ

ἐν τῇ

ἐν τῇ

ἐν τῇ

ἐν τῇ

ἐν τῇ

ἐν τῇ

ἐν τῇ

ἐν τῇ

ἐν τῇ

ἐν τῇ

ἐν τῇ

ἐν τῇ

ἐν τῇ

ἐν τῇ

ἐν τῇ

ἐν τῇ

partake of his care and inspection, As *Abraham* believed God, and it was imputed to him for righteousness, and he was called the friend of God, so all which are heirs of the faith of *Abraham* are made partakers of the same relation. Nor are we onely friends, but also sons; for behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God. Thus must we acknowledge that the Saints of God have communion with the Father, because by the great and precious promises given unto them, they become partakers of the divine nature.

Secondly, the Saints of God living in the Church of God have communion with the Son of God: for, as the Apostle said, our communion is with the Father and the Son; and this connexion is infallible, because he that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son; and our Saviour prayed for all such as should believe on him through the word of the Apostles, that they might be one, as the Father is one in him and he in the Father, that they also may be one in both. I in them, saith Christ, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one. This communion of the Saints with the Son of God, is, as most evident, so most remarkable. He hath taken unto him our nature and infirmities; he hath taken upon him our sins, and the curse due unto them; while we all have received of his fulness, grace for grace; and are all called to the fellowship of his sufferings that we may be conformable to his death. What is the fellowship of brethren and coheirs of the Bridegroom and the Spouse: what is the communion of members with the head, of branches with the Vine, that is the communion of Saints with Christ. For God hath called us unto the fellowship of his Son Jesus Christ our Lord.

Thirdly, the Saints of God in the Church of Christ have communion with the Holy Ghost; and the Apostle hath two ways assured us of the truth thereof one Rhetorically, by a seeming doubt, if there be any fellowship of the Spirit; the other devoutly, praying for it, The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost be with you all. The Saints are therefore such, because they partake of the Holy Ghost, for they are therefore holy because they are sanctified, and it is the Spirit alone which sanctifieth. Beside, the communion with the Father and the Son is wrought by the communication of the Spirit; for hereby do we become the Sons of God, in that we have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry Abba Father; and thereby do we become coheirs with Christ, in that, because we are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, Abba, Father; so that we are no more servants, but sons; and if sons, then heirs of God through Christ. This is the Communion which the Saints enjoy with the three persons of the blessed Trinity: this is the heavenly fellowship represented unto entertaining Abraham, when the Lord appeared unto him, and three men stood by him; for our Saviour hath made us this most precious promise, If any man love me he will keep my words, and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him and make our abode with him. Here is the soul of man made the habitation of God the Father and of God the Son; and the presence of the Spirit cannot be wanting where those two are inhabiting: for if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his. The Spirit therefore with the Father and the Son inhabiteth in the Saints; for know ye not, saith the Apostle, that ye are the Temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?

Fourthly, the Saints of God in the Church of Christ have communion with the holy Angels. They who did fore-tell the birth of John the fore-runner of Christ, they who did annunciate unto the blessed Virgin the conception of the Saviour of the world, they who sung a glorious hymn at the Nativity of the Son of God, they who carried the soul of Lazarus into Abraham's bosome,

they who appeared unto *Christ* from heaven in his agonie to strengthen him, they who opened the prison doors and brought the Apostles forth, they who at the end of the world shall sever the wicked from among the just, and gather together the elect of God, certainly they have a constant and perpetual relation to the children of God. Nay, *are they not all ministering spirits sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation?* They have a particular sense of our condition, for *Christ* hath assured us that *there is joy in the presence of the Angels of God over one sinner that repenteth.* And upon this relation the Angels, who are all the Angels, that is, the Messengers of God, are yet called the Angels of men, according to the admonition of *Christ*, *Take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones, for I say unto you, That in heaven their Angels do always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven.*

Heb. I. 14.

Luk. 15. 10.

Matt. 18. 10.

Thus far have we considered the *Communion of Saints* with such as are distinguished from them by nature as they are men; the fellowship which they have in heaven with God and his holy Angels, while they are on earth. Our next consideration will be, what is the communion which they have with those who are of the same nature, but not partakers of the same holiness with them.

Fifthly therefore, the Saints of God, while they are of the Church of *Christ* on earth, have some kind of communion with those men which are truly Saints. There were not hypocrites among the *Jews* alone, but in the Church of *Christ* many cry Lord, Lord, whom he knoweth not. The tares have the privilege of the field, as well as the wheat, and the bad fish of the net, as well as the good. The Saints have communion with hypocrites in all things with which the distinction of a Saint and Hypocrite can consist. They communicate in the same water, both externally baptized alike; they communicate in the same Creed, both make the same open profession of Faith, both agree in the acknowledgment of the same principles of Religion; they communicate in the same word, both hear the same doctrine preached; they communicate at the same table, both eat the same bread, and drink the wine, which *Christ* hath appointed to be received: but the Hypocrite doth not communicate with the Saint in the same saving grace, in the same true Faith working by love, and in the same renovation of mind and spirit, for then he were not an hypocrite but a Saint: a Saint doth not communicate with the hypocrite in the same sins, in the same lurking infidelity, in the same unfruitfulness under the means of grace, in the same false pretence and empty form of godliness, for then he were not a Saint but an hypocrite. Thus the Saints may communicate with the wicked, so they communicate not with their wickedness, and may have fellowship with sinners, so they have no fellowship with that which makes them such, that is, their sins. The Apostles command runneth thus, *Have no fellowship with the unfruitfull works of darkness;* and again, *Be not partaker of other mens sins;* and a voice from heaven spake concerning *Babylon*, *Come out of her my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins.* To communicate with sin is sin, but to communicate with a sinner in that which is not sin, can be no sin; because the one defileth, and the other cannot, and that which defileth not is no sin.

Ephes. 5. 11.

Mh Κυκοι-

νωντε τοις

εργοις.

1 Tim. 5. 22.

Mh κοιναυει

τε αμαρτιας.

Rev. 18. 4.

ἢ ἰνα μὴ

Κυκοινησθετε

τῇ αμαρτιας.

Rev. 18. 4.

ἢ ἰνα μὴ

Κυκοινησθετε

τῇ αμαρτιας.

Rev. 18. 4.

ἢ ἰνα μὴ

Κυκοινησθετε

τῇ αμαρτιας.

Rev. 18. 4.

ἢ ἰνα μὴ

Κυκοινησθετε

τῇ αμαρτιας.

Rev. 18. 4.

ἢ ἰνα μὴ

Κυκοινησθετε

τῇ αμαρτιας.

Rev. 18. 4.

ἢ ἰνα μὴ

Κυκοινησθετε

τῇ αμαρτιας.

Rev. 18. 4.

ἢ ἰνα μὴ

Κυκοινησθετε

τῇ αμαρτιας.

Rev. 18. 4.

ἢ ἰνα μὴ

Κυκοινησθετε

τῇ αμαρτιας.

Rev. 18. 4.

ἢ ἰνα μὴ

Κυκοινησθετε

τῇ αμαρτιας.

Rev. 18. 4.

ἢ ἰνα μὴ

Κυκοινησθετε

τῇ αμαρτιας.

Rev. 18. 4.

ἢ ἰνα μὴ

Κυκοινησθετε

τῇ αμαρτιας.

Rev. 18. 4.

ἢ ἰνα μὴ

Κυκοινησθετε

τῇ αμαρτιας.

Rev. 18. 4.

ἢ ἰνα μὴ

Κυκοινησθετε

τῇ αμαρτιας.

Rev. 18. 4.

ἢ ἰνα μὴ

Κυκοινησθετε

τῇ αμαρτιας.

Rev. 18. 4.

ἢ ἰνα μὴ

Κυκοινησθετε

τῇ αμαρτιας.

Rev. 18. 4.

ἢ ἰνα μὴ

Κυκοινησθετε

τῇ αμαρτιας.

Rev. 18. 4.

ἢ ἰνα μὴ

Κυκοινησθετε

τῇ αμαρτιας.

Rev. 18. 4.

ἢ ἰνα μὴ

Κυκοινησθετε

τῇ αμαρτιας.

Rev. 18. 4.

ἢ ἰνα μὴ

Κυκοινησθετε

τῇ αμαρτιας.

Rev. 18. 4.

ἢ ἰνα μὴ

Κυκοινησθετε

τῇ αμαρτιας.

Rev. 18. 4.

ἢ ἰνα μὴ

Κυκοινησθετε

τῇ αμαρτιας.

Rev. 18. 4.

ἢ ἰνα μὴ

Κυκοινησθετε

τῇ αμαρτιας.

Rev. 18. 4.

ἢ ἰνα μὴ

Κυκοινησθετε

τῇ αμαρτιας.

Rev. 18. 4.

ἢ ἰνα μὴ

Κυκοινησθετε

τῇ αμαρτιας.

Rev. 18. 4.

ἢ ἰνα μὴ

Κυκοινησθετε

τῇ αμαρτιας.

Rev. 18. 4.

ἢ ἰνα μὴ

Κυκοινησθετε

τῇ αμαρτιας.

Rev. 18. 4.

ἢ ἰνα μὴ

Κυκοινησθετε

τῇ αμαρτιας.

Rev. 18. 4.

ἢ ἰνα μὴ

Κυκοινησθετε

τῇ αμαρτιας.

Rev. 18. 4.

ἢ ἰνα μὴ

Κυκοινησθετε

τῇ αμαρτιας.

Rev. 18. 4.

ἢ ἰνα μὴ

Κυκοινησθετε

τῇ αμαρτιας.

Rev. 18. 4.

ἢ ἰνα μὴ

Κυκοινησθετε

τῇ αμαρτιας.

Rev. 18. 4.

ἢ ἰνα μὴ

Κυκοινησθετε

τῇ αμαρτιας.

Rev. 18. 4.

ἢ ἰνα μὴ

Κυκοινησθετε

τῇ αμαρτιας.

Rev. 18. 4.

ἢ ἰνα μὴ

Κυκοινησθετε

τῇ αμαρτιας.

Rev. 18. 4.

ἢ ἰνα μὴ

Κυκοινησθετε

τῇ αμαρτιας.

Rev. 18. 4.

ἢ ἰνα μὴ

Κυκοινησθετε

τῇ αμαρτιας.

Rev. 18. 4.

ἢ ἰνα μὴ

Κυκοινησθετε

τῇ αμαρτιας.

Rev. 18. 4.

ἢ ἰνα μὴ

Κυκοινησθετε

τῇ αμαρτιας.

Rev. 18. 4.

ἢ ἰνα μὴ

Κυκοινησθετε

τῇ αμαρτιας.

Rev. 18. 4.

ἢ ἰνα μὴ

Κυκοινησθετε

τῇ αμαρτιας.

Rev. 18. 4.

ἢ ἰνα μὴ

Κυκοινησθετε

τῇ αμαρτιας.

Rev. 18. 4.

ἢ ἰνα μὴ

Κυκοινησθετε

τῇ αμαρτιας.

Rev. 18. 4.

ἢ ἰνα μὴ

Κυκοινησθετε

τῇ αμαρτιας.

Rev. 18. 4.

ἢ ἰνα μὴ

Κυκοινησθετε

τῇ αμαρτιας.

Rev. 18. 4.

ἢ ἰνα μὴ

Κυκοινησθετε

τῇ αμαρτιας.

Rev. 18. 4.

ἢ ἰνα μὴ

Κυκοινησθετε

τῇ αμαρτιας.

Rev. 18. 4.

ἢ ἰνα μὴ

Κυκοινησθετε

τῇ αμαρτιας.

Rev. 18. 4.

ἢ ἰνα μὴ

Κυκοινησθετε

τῇ αμαρτιας.

Rev. 18. 4.

ἢ ἰνα μὴ

Κυκοινησθετε

τῇ αμαρτιας.

Rev. 18. 4.

ἢ ἰνα μὴ

Κυκοινησθετε

τῇ αμαρτιας.

Rev. 18. 4.

ἢ ἰνα μὴ

Κυκοινησθετε

τῇ αμαρτιας.

Rev. 18. 4.

ἢ ἰνα μὴ

Κυκοινησθετε

τῇ αμαρτιας.

Rev. 18. 4.

ἢ ἰνα μὴ

Κυκοινησθετε

τῇ αμαρτιας.

Rev. 18. 4.

ἢ ἰνα μὴ

Κυκοινησθετε

τῇ αμαρτιας.

Rev. 18. 4.

ἢ ἰνα μὴ

Κυκοινησθετε

τῇ αμαρτιας.

Rev. 18. 4.

ἢ ἰνα μὴ

Κυκοινησθετε

τῇ αμαρτιας.

Rev. 18. 4.

ἢ ἰνα μὴ

Κυκοινησθετε

τῇ αμαρτιας.

Rev. 18. 4.

ἢ ἰνα μὴ

Sixthly therefore, the Saints of God living in the Church of *Christ* have communion with all the Saints living in the same Church. *If we walk in the light, we have fellowship one with another*: we all have benefit of the same ordinances, all partake of the same promises, we are all endued with the graces of the same mutual love and affection, keeping the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace, all engrafted into the same stock, and for receiving life from the same root, all *holding the same head, from which all the body by joynts and bands having nourishment ministred and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God.* For in the philosophy of the Apostle the nerves are not onely the instruments of motion and sensation, but of nutrition also; so that every member receiveth nourishment by their intervention from the head: and being the head of the body is *Christ*, and all the Saints are members of that body, they all partake of the same nourishment, and so have all communion among themselves.

Lastly, the Saints of God living in the Church of *Christ*, are in communion with all the Saints † departed out of this life and admitted to the presence of God. *Jerusalem* sometimes is taken for the Church on earth, sometimes for that part of the Church which is in heaven, to shew that as both are represented by one, so both are but one City of God. Wherefore thus doth the Apostle speak to such as are called to the Christian Faith, *Ye are come unto mount Sion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and an innumerable company of Angels, to the general Assembly and Church of the first-born, which are written in heaven, and to God the judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect, and to Jesus the Mediatour of the new Covenant.* Indeed, the Communion of Saints in the Church of *Christ* with those which are departed is demonstrated by their communion with the Saints alive. For if I have communion with a Saint of God, as such, while he liveth here, I must still have communion with him when he is departed hence; because the foundation of that communion cannot be removed by death. The mystical union between *Christ* and his Church, the spiritual conjunction of the members to the head, is the true foundation of that communion which one member hath with another, all the members living and increasing by the same influence which they receive from him. But death, which is nothing else but the separation of the Soul from the body, maketh no separation in the mystical union, no breach of the spiritual conjunction, and consequently, there must continue the same communion, because there remaineth the same foundation. Indeed, the Saint departed, before his death had some communion with the hypocrite, as hearing the word, professing the Faith, receiving the Sacraments together; which being in things onely external, as they were common to them both, and all such external actions ceasing in the person dead, the hypocrite remaining loseth all communion with the Saint departing, and the Saints surviving cease to have further fellowship with the hypocrite dying. But the true and unfeigned holiness of man wrought by the powerful influence of the Spirit of God not onely remaineth, but also is improved after death; being the correspondence of the internal holiness was the communion between their persons in their life, they cannot be said to be divided by death, which had no power over that sanctity by which they were first conjoined.

This Communion of the Saints in heaven and earth, upon the mystical union of *Christ* their head, being fundamental and internal, what acts or external operations it produceth is not so certain. That we communicate with them in hope of that happiness which they actually enjoy is evident; that we have the Spirit of God given us as an earnest, and so a part of their felicity is

1 John 1. 7.
κοινωνία
μετ' ἀλλή-
λων.

Coloss. 2. 19.

† This is that
part of the
Communion of
Saints which
those of the
Ancients espe-
cially insisted
upon, who first
took notice of
it in the
Creed.

Sanctorum
Communio-
nem, id est,
cum illis San-
ctis qui in
hac quam su-
scipimus fide
defuncti sunt
societate &
spei commu-
nionem tene-
mur, Serm.
181. de Tem-
pore. Et qui
nunc cognos-
citis per au-
ditum com-
munionem
habeatis cum
Sanctis Mar-
tyribus, &
per illos cum
Domino Jesu
Christo.
Præf. Pass. S.
Perpetue.
* Heb. 12. 22;
23.

certain. But what they doe in heaven in relation to us on earth particularly considered, or what we ought to perform in reference to them in heaven, beside a reverential respect, and study of imitation, is not revealed unto us in the Scriptures, nor can be concluded by necessary deduction from any principles of Christianity. They which first found this part of the Article in the Creed, and delivered their exposition unto us, have made no greater enlargement of this Communion, as to the Saints of heaven, then the society * of hope, esteem and imitation on our side, of desires and supplications on their side : and what is now taught by the Church of Rome, is, as unwarrantable, so a novitious interpretation.

* we have already produced the words of the 181. Sermon de Tempore, concerning

hope. In the same we find also that of imitation, Si igitur cum Sanctis in æterna vita communionem habere volumus, de imitatione eorum cogitemus. Debent enim in nobis aliquid recognoscere de suis virtutibus, ut pro nobis dignentur Domino supplicare, *ib.* Hæc sunt vestigia quæ nobis Sancti quoque revertentes in patriam nobis reliquerant, ut illorum semitis inhaerentes sequeremur ad gaudia, *ibid.* Beside this imitation, he addeth their desires and care for us below. Cur non properamus & currimus ut patriam nostram videre possimus? Magnus illic charorum numerus expectat, parentum, fratrum, filiorum, frequens nos & copiosa turba desiderat jam de sua incolumitate secuta, adhuc de nostra salute sollicita, *ibid.* Of the venerable esteem we ought to have of them, speaks Eusebius Gallicanus, Credamus & Sanctorum communionem, sed Sanctos non tam pro Dei parte, quam pro Dei honore veneremur. And again, Digne nobis venerandi sunt dum Dei cultum, & future vite desiderium contemptu mortis insinuant. Thus far anciently they which expounded this Article: but the late Exposition of the Church of Rome runneth thus, Non solum Ecclesia quæ est in terris communicat bona sua cum omnibus membris sibi conjunctis, sed etiam communicat suffragia Ecclesiæ quæ est in Purgatorio, & Ecclesiæ quæ est in cœlis communicat orationes, & merita sua cum Ecclesiâ quæ est in terris, Bellarm. in Symbolam. Where the communication of the Suffrages of the Saints alive to the Church in Purgatory, and the communication of the merits of the Saints in heaven to the Saints on earth, are novel expositions of this Article, not so much as acknowledged by Thomas Aquinas in his Explication of the Creed, much less to be found in any of the Ancients Expositors of it.

The necessity of the belief of this Communion of Saints appeareth, first,
 1 John 1.6,7. in that it is proper to excite and encourage us to holiness of life. If we walk
 2 Cor. 6. 14, 15 in the light, as God is in the light, we have fellowship one with another. But if we say that we have fellowship with him, and walk in darkness, we lie, and do not the truth. For what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness? and what concord hath Christ with
 Acts 26. 18. Belial? When Christ sent S. Paul to the Gentiles, it was to open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they might receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith that is in Christ. Except we be turned from darkness, except we be taken out of the power of Satan, which is the dominion of sin, we cannot receive the inheritance among them who are sanctified, we cannot be thought meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the Saints in light. Indeed there can be no communion where there is no similitude, no fellowship with God without some sanctity; because his nature is infinitely holy, and his actions are not subject to the least iniquity.

Col. 1. 12.

Secondly, the belief of the Communion of Saints is necessary to stir us up to a proportionate gratitude unto God, and an humble and chearfull acknowledgment of so great a benefit. We cannot but acknowledge that they are exceeding great and precious promises, by which we become partakers of the divine nature. What am I? said David, and what is my life that I should be son in law to the King? What are we the sons of men, what are they which are called to be Saints, that they should have fellowship with God the Father? S. Philip the Apostle said unto our Saviour, Lord, shew us the Father and it sufficeth; whereas he hath not onely shewn us, but come unto us with the Father, and dwelt within us by his holy Spirit; he hath called us to the fellowship of the Angels and Archangels, of the Cherubins and Seraphins, to the glorious company of the Apostles, to the goodly fellowship of the Prophets, to the noble Army of Martyrs, to the holy Church militant in earth, and triumphant in heaven.

2 Pet. 1. 4.

1 Sam. 18. 18.

John 14. 8.

Thirdly, the belief of the Communion of Saints is necessary to inflame our hearts with an ardent affection towards those which live, and a reverent respect

spect towards those which are departed and are now with God. Nearness of relation requireth affection, and that man is unnatural who loveth not those persons which nature hath more immediately conjoined to him. Now no conjunction natural can be compared with that which is spiritual, no temporal relation with that which is eternal. If similitude of shape and feature will create a kindness, if congruity of manners and disposition will conjoin affections; what should be the mutual love of those who have the image of the same God renewed within them, of those who are endued with the gracious influences of the same Spirit? And if all the Saints of God living in communion of the Church deserve the best of our affections here on earth: certainly when they are dissolved and with *Christ*, when they have been blessed with a sight of God, and rewarded with a Crown of glory, they may challenge some respect from us who are here to wait upon the will of God expecting when such a happy change shall come.

Fourthly, this tendeth to the directing and enlarging our acts of charity. We are obliged to be charitable unto all men, because the love of our Brother is the foundation of our duty towards man, and in the language of the Scriptures whosoever is another is our Brother; but we are particularly directed to them that are of the household of faith. And as there is a general reason calling for our mercy and kindness unto all men, so there is a more special reason urging those who are truly sanctified by the Spirit of God to do good unto such as appear to be led by the same Spirit: for if they communicate with them in the everlasting mercies of God, it is fit they should partake of the bowels of mans compassion; * if they communicate with them in things spiritual, and eternal, can it be much that they should partake with them of such things as are temporal and carnal?

To conclude every one may learn from hence what he is to understand by this part of the Article, in which he professeth to believe *the Communion of Saints*; for thereby he is conceived to express thus much, I am fully persuaded of this as of a necessary and infallible truth, that such persons as are truly sanctified in the Church of *Christ*, while they live among the crooked generations of men, and struggle with all the miseries of this world, have fellowship with God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, as dwelling with them, and taking up their habitations in them: that they partake of the care and kindness of the blessed Angels, who take delight in the ministration for their benefit: that beside the external fellowship which they have in the Word and Sacraments with all the members of the Church, they have an intimate union and conjunction with all the Saints on earth as the living members of *Christ*; nor is this union separated by the death of any, but as *Christ* in whom they live, is the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world, so have they fellowship with all the Saints which from the death of *Abel* have ever departed in the true faith and fear of God, and now enjoy the presence of the Father, and follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth. And thus I believe *the Communion of Saints*.

* Κοινωνή-
σεις ἐν πάσ
τῃ πλησίαν
σῶ· ἐκ ἐφῆς
ἰδία· εἰ γὰρ ἐ
πὶς ἀφάρ-
τοις κοινωνοῦ
ἐστε, πόσῃ
μᾶλλον ἐν
τοῖς φθαρτοῖς·
Barnabæ E-
pist. par. 2.
cap. 1.

ARTICLE X.

The Forgiveness of Sins.

* Therefore
Cavolus Ma-
gus in his Ca-
pitular. l. 3.
c. 6. inveighs
against Basili-
us the Bishop
of Ancyra, be-
cause in his
Confession of
Faith which
he delivered
in the second
Council of
Nice (Act. 1.)

THis Article hath * always been expressly contained and acknowledged in the Creed, as being a most necessary part of our Christian profession: and for some ages it immediately followed the Belief of the † *Holy Church*. and was therefore added immediately after it, to shew that the remission of sins was to be obtained in the . . Church of *Christ*. For being the Creed at first was made to be used as a Confession of such as were to be baptized, declaring their Faith in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, in whose baptism they were to be admitted, and the forgiveness of sins, which by the same baptism was to be obtained; and therefore in some Creeds it was particularly expressed, † *I believe one baptism for the forgiveness of sins.*

he omitted the Remission of sins, which the Apostles in so short a Compendium as the Creed would not omit. Hanc Apostoli in conlatione fidei, quam ab invicem discessuri quasi quendam credulitatis & prædicationis normam statuerunt, post confessionem Patris & Filii & Spiritus Sancti posuisse perhibentur; & in tanti verbi brevitate, de quo per Prophetam dictum est, Verbum abbreviarum faciet Dominus super terram, hanc ponere minime distulerunt, quia sine hac fidei sinceritatem integram esse minime perpexerunt. Nec cohibuit eos ab ejus professione illius Symboli brevitatis, quam exposcebat sacræ fidei integritas, tantique doni veneranda sublimitas.

† Concordant autem Angeli nobiscum etiam tunc cum remittuntur nostra peccata. Ideo post commemorationem S. Ecclesiæ in ordine Confessionis ponitur Remissio peccatorum: per hanc enim stat Ecclesiæ quæ in terris est, per hanc non perit, quod perierat & inventum est, S. Aug. Enchirid. cap. 64. And to this purpose it is that in his book De Agone Christiano, passing from one Article to another with his general transition; after that of the Church, he proceedeth with these words, Nec eos audiamus qui negant Ecclesiæ Dei omnia peccata posse dimittere, cap. 31. So it followeth also in Venantius Fortunatus, and in such other Creeds as want that part of the former Article of the Communion of Saints.

2. in Genesin. Sanctam Ecclesiā teneat . . . in qua & remissio peccatorum & carnis resurrectionis prædicabatur, Russin. in Symb. Sed neque de ipsis criminibus quamlibet magnis remittendis in S. Ecclesiā desperanda est misericordia, S. Aug. Enchirid. cap. 65. In remissionem peccatorum. Hæc in Ecclesiā si non esset, nulla spes esset. Remissio peccatorum si in Ecclesiā non esset, nulla futuræ vitæ & liberationis æternæ spes esset. Gratiā agimus Deo, qui Ecclesiæ suæ dedit hoc donum, Author Homil. 119. de Tempore. Quia singuli quique cæteris Hæreticorum se potissimum Christianos, & suam esse Catholicam Ecclesiā putant; sciendum est illam esse veram, in qua est religio, confessio, & poenitentia, quæ peccata & vulnera, quibus est subjecta imbecillitas carnis salubriter curat. Lactant. l. 4. c. 30.

¶ These are the words of the Constantinopolitan Creed, 'Ὁμολογῶ ἐν βάπτισμα εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμάρτων, in the Larger, Πιστεύω εἰς μίαν καθολικὴν καὶ ἀποστολικὴν Ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ εἰς βάπτισμα ὁμολογίας, in Anacrato. S. Cyril both these together, Εἰς ἐν βάπτισμα ὁμολογίας εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμάρτων. Pelegrinus Laureac. Episc. Credo unum Baptismum in remissionem omnium peccatorum. Symbolum Ethiopicum. Credimus unum Baptisma in remissionem omnium peccatorum in secula seculorum.

Looking thus upon this Article, with this relation, we find the sense of it must be this, that we believe *forgiveness of sins* is to be obtained in the Church of *Christ*. For the explication whereof it will be necessary; first, to declare what is the nature of Remission of sins, in what that action doth consist: secondly, to shew how so great a Privilege is propounded in the Church, and how it may be procured by the members of the Church. That we may understand the notion of *forgiveness of sins*, three Considerations are required; first, what is the nature of Sin, which is to be forgiven: secondly, what is the guilt or obligation of Sin, which wanteth forgiveness; thirdly, what is the remission it self, or the loosing of that obligation.

As the power of Sin is revealed onely in the Scriptures, so the nature of it is best understood from thence. And though the writings of the Apostles give us few definitions, yet we may find even in them a proper definition of Sin. *Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law*, saith S. John, and then rendreth this reason of that universal assertion, *for sin is the transgression of the law*. Which is an Argument drawn from the Definition of Sin; for he saith not, *Every sin is the transgression of the law*, which had been necessary, if he had spoken by way of proposition onely, to have proved the Universality of his Assertion, but produceth it indefinitely, *Sin is the transgression of the Law*, which

which is sufficient speaking it by way of † definition. And it is elsewhere most evident that every sin is something prohibited by some law, and deviating from the same. For the Apostle affirming, that *the law worketh wrath*, that is, a punishment from God, giveth this as a reason or proof of his affirmation, *for where no law is there is no transgression*. The law of God is the rule of the actions of men, and any aberration from that rule is * sin: the law of God is pure, and whatsoever is contrary to that law is impure. Whatsoever therefore is done by man, or is in man having any contrariety or opposition to the law of God, is sin. Every action, every word, every thought against the law is a sin of commission, as it is terminated to an object dissonant from, and contrary unto the prohibition of the Law, or a negative precept. Every omission of a duty required of us is a sin, as being contrary to the commanding part of the law, or an affirmative precept. Every evil habit contracted in the soul of man by the actions committed against the law of God, is a sin constituting a man truly a sinner, even then when he actually sinneth not. Any corruption and inclination in the soul to do that which God forbiddeth, and to omit that which God commandeth, howsoever such corruption and evil inclination came into that soul, whether by an act of his own will, or by an act of the will of another, is a sin, as being something dissonant and repugnant to the Law of God. And this I conceive sufficient to declare the nature of Sin.

† The manner of the Apostles speech is also to be observed, having an Article prefixed both to the subject and the predicate; as if thereby he would make the proposition convertible, as all definitions ought to be, *Hæc est materia*.

* Rom. 4. 15. Quid est peccatum nisi prævaricatio legis divinæ, & cœlestium inobedientia peccatorum? S. Ambrosius, de Paradiso, c. 8. Peccatum est factum vel

dictum vel concupitum aliquid contra æternam legem, S. Aug. contra Faustum, l. 22. c. 27. Quid verum est nisi dare præcepta, & animas liberæ esse voluntatis, & malum naturam non esse, sed esse aversionem à Dei præceptis? Idem de Fide contra Manichæos, cap. 10. Neque negandum est hoc Deum jubere, ita nos in facienda justitia esse debere perfectos ut nullum habeamus omnino peccatum: nam neque peccatum erit, si quid erit, si non divinitus jubeatur ut non sit, Idem de Pec. Meritis & Rem. lib. 2. cap. 16.

The second particular to be considered is the Obligation of Sin, which must be presupposed to the solution or remission of it. Now every sin doth cause a guilt, and every sinner, by being so, becomes a guilty person: which guilt consisteth in a debt or obligation to suffer a punishment proportionable to the iniquity of the Sin. It is the nature of Laws in general to be attended with these two, punishments, and rewards; the one propounded for the observation of them, the other threatened upon the deviation from them. And although there were no threats or penal denunciations accompanying the Laws of God, yet the transgression of them would nevertheless make the person transgressing worthy of, and liable unto, whatsoever punishment can in justice be inflicted for that sin committed. Sins of commission pass away in the acting or performing of them, so that he which acteth against a negative precept, after the act is passed, cannot properly be said to sin. Sins of omission, when the time is passed in which the affirmative precept did oblige unto performance, pass away: so that he which did then omit his duty when it was required, and in omitting sinned, after that time cannot be truly said to sin. But though the sin it self do pass away together with the time in which it was committed, yet the guilt thereof doth never pass which by committing was contracted. He which but once committeth adultery, at that one time sinneth, and at no time after can be said to commit that sin; but the guilt of that sin remaineth on him still, and he may be for ever said to be guilty of adultery, because he is for ever subject to the wrath of God, and † obliged to suffer the punishment due unto adultery.

† This obligation unto punishment, remaining after

the act of sin, is that Peccati Reatus, of which the Schools, and before them the Fathers speak. The nature of this Reatus is excellently declared by S. Austin delivering the distinction between actual and original sin. In eis qui regenerantur in Christo cum remissionem accipiunt proflus omnium peccatorum, utique necesse est ut reatus etiam hujus licet adhuc manentis Concupiscentiæ remittatur, ut in peccatum non imputetur. Nam sicut peccatorum quæ manere non possunt, quoniam cum sunt præterierunt, reatus tamen manet, & nisi remittatur, in æternum manebit, sic illius Concupiscentiæ, quando remittitur, reatus auferitur. Hoc est enim

enim non habere peccatum, reum non esse peccati. Nam si quisquam virg. fecerit adulterium etiam nunquam deinceps faciat reus est adulterii, donec reatus ipsius indulgentia remittatur. Habet ergo peccatum, quamvis illud quod admisit jam non sit, quia cum tempore quo factum est prateriit. Nam si a peccando desistere hoc esset non habere peccatum sufficeret ut hoc nos moneret Scriptura. *Fili peccasti, non adicias iterum*: Non autem sufficit, sed addidit, *Et de peccatis deprecare, ut tibi remittantur*. Manent ergo nisi remittantur. Sed quomodo manent si praterita sunt, nisi quia praterierunt actus, manent reatu, *S. Aug. de Nupt. & Concupis. lib. 1. cap. 26*. Ego de Concupiscentia dixi quae est in membris repugnans legi mentis, quamvis Reatus ejus in omnium peccatorum remissione transferat, sicut è contrario sacrificium idolis factum, si deinceps non fiat, prateriit actus, sed manet reatu, nisi per indulgentiam remittatur. Quiddam enim tale est sacrificare idolis ut opus ipsum cum sit praterit, eodemque praterito Reatus ejus maneat venia resolvendus, *Idem contra Julianum, lib. 6. cap. 8*.

This debt or obligation to punishment is not onely necessarily resulting from the nature of sin, as it is a breach of the law, nor onely generally delivered in the Scriptures revealing the wrath of God unto all unrighteousness, but is yet more particularly represented in the Word, which teacheth us, if we do ill, how *sin lieth at the door*. Our blessed Saviour thus taught his Disciples, *a Whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be liable (obnoxious, or bound over) to the Judgment; and whosoever shall say to his brother, Racha, shall be liable (obnoxious, or bound over) to the Council; but whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be liable (obnoxious, or bound over) to hell fire*. So saith our Saviour again, *b All sins shall be forgiven unto the sons of men, and blasphemies wherewithsoever they shall blaspheme. But he that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost, hath never forgiveness, but is liable (obnoxious, or bound over) to eternal damnation*. Whence appeareth clearly the guilt of Sin and obligation to eternal punishment, if there be no remission or forgiveness of it, and the taking off that liableness, obnoxiousness, or obligation unto death, if there be any such remission or forgiveness: all which is evident by the opposition, much to be observed in our Saviour's expression, *He hath never forgiveness, but is liable to eternal death*.

^a Matt. 5. 22.

^b Εὐχος ἔσται

is the word

used here,

which is trans-

lated, shall

be in danger,

but is of a sul-

der and more

pressing sense,

as one which

is a debtor,

subject, and

obliged to en-

dure it, Hesyc.

^c Εὐχος

ἔσται

ἔσται

ἔσται

ἔσται

ἔσται

ἔσται

ἔσται

ἔσται

ἔσται

ἔσται

ἔσται

ἔσται

ἔσται

ἔσται

ἔσται

ἔσται

ἔσται

ἔσται

ἔσται

ἔσται

ἔσται

ἔσται

ἔσται

ἔσται

ἔσται

ἔσται

ἔσται

ἔσται

ἔσται

ἔσται

ἔσται

ἔσται

ἔσται

ἔσται

ἔσται

ἔσται

ἔσται

ἔσται

ἔσται

ἔσται

ἔσται

ἔσται

ἔσται

ἔσται

ἔσται

ἔσται

ἔσται

ἔσται

ἔσται

ἔσται

ἔσται

ἔσται

ἔσται

ἔσται

ἔσται

God who hath the Sovereign power and absolute dominion over all men, hath made a law to be a perpetual and universal rule of humane actions; which law whosoever doth violate, or transgress, and thereby sin, (for by sin we understand nothing else but the transgression of the law) is thereby obliged in all equity to suffer the punishment due to that obliquity. And after the act of sin is committed and passed over, this guilt resulting from that act, remaineth; that is, the person who committed it, continueth still a debtor to the vindictive Justice of God, and is obliged to endure the punishment due unto it: which was the second particular to be considered.

The third Consideration now followeth, what is the *Forgiveness of Sin*, or in what *Remission* doth consist. Which at first appeareth to be an act of God toward a sinner, because the sin was committed against the law of God, and therefore the punishment must be due from him, because the injury was done unto him. But what is the true notion and nature of this act, or how God doth

enim non habere peccatum, reum non esse peccati. Nam si quisquam virg. fecerit adulterium etiam nunquam deinceps faciat reus est adulterii, donec reatus ipsius indulgentia remittatur. Habere ergo peccatum, quamvis illud quod admisit jam non sit, quia cum tempore quo factum est præterit. Nam si a peccando desistere hoc esset non habere peccatum sufficeret ut hoc nos moneret Scriptura. *Fili peccasti, non adjicias iterum*: Non autem sufficit, sed addidit, *Et de pristinis deprecare, ut tibi remittantur*. Manent ergo nisi remittantur. Sed quomodo manent si præterita sunt, nisi quia præterierunt actus, manent reatu, *S. Aug. de Nupt. & Concupis. lib. 1. cap. 26.* Ego de Concupiscentia dixi quæ est in membris repugnans legi mentis, quamvis Reatus ejus in omnium peccatorum remissione transferit, sicut è contrario sacrificium idolis factum, si deinceps non fiat, præterit actus, sed manet reatu, nisi per indulgentiam remittatur. Quiddam enim tale est sacrificare idolis ut opus ipsum cum sit prætereat, eodemque præterito Reatus ejus maneat venia resolvendus, *Idem contra Julianum, lib. 6. cap. 8.*

This debt or obligation to punishment is not onely necessarily resulting from the nature of sin, as it is a breach of the law, nor onely generally delivered in the Scriptures revealing the wrath of God unto all unrighteousness, but is yet more particularly represented in the Word, which teacheth us, if we do ill, how *sin lieth at the door*. Our blessed Saviour thus taught his Disciples, *a Whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be liable (obnoxious, or bound over) to the Judgment; and whosoever shall say to his brother, Racha, shall be liable (obnoxious, or bound over) to the Council; but whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be liable (obnoxious, or bound over) to hell fire.* So saith our Saviour again, *b All sins shall be forgiven unto the sons of men, and blasphemies wherewithsoever they shall blaspheme. But he that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost, hath never forgiveness, but is liable (obnoxious, or bound over) to eternal damnation.* Whence appeareth clearly the guilt of Sin and obligation to eternal punishment, if there be no remission or forgiveness of it, and the taking off that liableness, obnoxiousness, or obligation unto death, if there be any such remission or forgiveness: all which is evident by the opposition, much to be observed in our Saviour's expression, *He hath never forgiveness, but is liable to eternal death.*

where by the way is to be observed a great mistake in the Lexicon of Favorinus, whose words are these; *Ενοχος, ὁ δὲ θωός, ὁ δὲ θωός.* *Ενοχος* for *Ενοχος*, absurdly *Τίμαιος* is added either as an interpretation of *Ενοχος*, or as an Author which used it, whereas *Τίμαιος* in Suidas is only the first word of the sentence, provided by Suidas for the use of *Ενοχος* in the signification of *ὁ δὲ θωός*. Agreeable unto Hesychius is that in the Lexicon of S. Cyril: *Ενοχος, Obnoxius, reus, obligatus.* And so in this place of S. Matthew the old Latine Translation, Reus erit judicio. As in Vngli, Constituum ante aras vori reus, Servius, Vori reus, Debitor. Unde vota solventes dicimus absolutos. Inde est, Damnatis in queque votis, quasi reos facies. So the Syriack, *ܐܢܝܢ ܕܢܝܢܐ* from *ܢܝܢ* obligatum, debitorem, reum esse. For indeed the word *Ενοχος* among the Greeks, as to this matter, hath a double signification, one in respect of the sin, another in respect of the punishment due unto the sin. In respect of a sin, as that in Aatipha, *μηδὲν ὅτις ἔνοχος ἔστιν ἔργῳ*, and that in Aristotle Oecon. 2. *ἐνοχὸν ἔστιν ἰσχυρίαν ἔσθαι*, and that in Suidas, taken out of Polybius, *Τίμαιος καὶ ἔνοχος πεινῶν* καὶ ἀδελφῶν αὐτοῦ ὅτι ἐν δυνάμει ἀμνηστίας ἐνοχος ἔσθαι, ὅτι καὶ κατὰ τὴν φύσιν αὐτοῦ τὸ ἐνοχὸν οἷς αὐτοῦ ἐνοχὸς ἔσθαι. In respect of the punishment of a sin, he is *Ενοχος* ὁ δὲ θωός, who is obnoxious to the curse, and *Ενοχος* ὁ δὲ θωός, obnoxious to the punishment. *Εμπνίου, εμπνίου, τρεῖς, ἐνοχὸς πνιῶν*, ὅτι ἐν οἷς ἡ μὴ δὲ δὲς πνεύματος, saith Suidas. Thus *Ενοχος* δανάτου ἔσθαι, Matt. 26. 66. *ܐܢܝܢ ܕܢܝܢܐ* is not in the intention of the Jews, he is in danger of death, but, he deserveth death, and he ought to die, he is *κατάδικος*, by their sentence, as far as in them lay, condemned to die. S. Chrysostome, *Τί ἔναι ἐνοχός; ἐνοχὸς ἔσθαι δανάτου*. ἢ οἷς κατάδικον λαβόντες, ἔσθαι ἢ πλάττειν δάμνην ἀποφασίζοντες, καὶ ἀποφασίζοντες. ὁ δὲ καὶ κείνος ὡς ἀποφασίζοντες φασίν, *Ενοχος* δανάτου ἔσθαι, αὐτοὶ κατὰ τὴν φύσιν, αὐτοὶ κατάδικον, αὐτοὶ ἀποφασίζοντες, πᾶσι αὐτοὶ γινώσκοντες τότε. *b* Mat. 3. 28, 29.

God who hath the Sovereign power and absolute dominion over all men, hath made a law to be a perpetual and universal rule of humane actions; which law whosoever doth violate, or transgress, and thereby sin, (for by sin we understand nothing else but the transgression of the law) is thereby obliged in all equity to suffer the punishment due to that obliquity. And after the act of sin is committed and passed over, this guilt resulting from that act, remaineth; that is, the person who committed it, continueth still a debtor to the vindictive Justice of God, and is obliged to endure the punishment due unto it: which was the second particular to be considered.

The third Consideration now followeth, what is the *Forgiveness of Sin*, or in what *Remission* doth consist. Which at first appeareth to be an act of God toward a sinner, because the sin was committed against the law of God, and therefore the punishment must be due from him, because the injury was done unto him. But what is the true notion and nature of this act, or how God doth

doth forgive a sinner, is not easie to determine : nor can it be concluded out of the words themselves which do expresse it, the niceties of whose † originations will never be able to yield a just interpretation.

† The word used in the Creed is *ἀπο-*

and that generally likewise in use in the New Testament. But from thence we cannot be assured of the nature of this all of God, because ἀφίνα and ἀφεσις are capable of several interpretations. For sometimes ἀφίνα is emissive, and ἀφεσις emissive. As Gen. 35. 18. Ἐξήνετο ὁ ἐν πνεύματι αὐτῶν πῶς ἔφυγε, not cum dimittente eam anima, as it is translated, but cum emittente ea animam; i. e. efflaris. 3. ἀφίνα τοῦ πνεύματος, emitit Spiritum, Mat. 25. 50. So Gen. 45. 2. Καὶ ἀφίνα φωνῇ μεγάλῃ, no dimisit, but emitit vocem cum fletu, as ἀφίνα φωνῇ μεγάλῃ, emitit voce magna, Mat. 15. 37. In the like manner ἀφεσις διαδρομῆς are emissiones maris, 2 Sam. 12. 16. as ἀφεσις ὕδατων, Joel 1. 20. to which sense may be ascribed that of Helyck. Ἀφισιν ὕδατων. And this interpretation of ἀφεσις can have no relation to the remission of sins. Secondly, ἀφίνα is often taken for permittere, as Gen. 20. 6. καὶ ἀφίνα σε ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ αὐτῆς. Matt. 3. 15. ἀφισιν, ὅτι τίτε ἀφίνα αὐτῶν, which the vulgar translated well Sine modo, and then ill, Tunc dimisit eum, Matt. 7. 4. ἀφισ ἐκείνου, sine ejiciam; so Helyck, ἀφεσις, συγχωρησις. And this hath as little relation to the present subject. Thirdly, ἀφίνα is sometimes relinquere, and deterere, as Gen. 43. 33. ἀφισθὲν ἀναφίσετε ὡς ἐμὲ ἐμῶ. Matt. 5. 24. ἀφισ ἐκεῖ τοῦ δόξου. Lu. 7. 4. καὶ ἀφίκεν αὐτῷ ὁ πυρρῶς, 19. 27. ἰδοὺ, ἡμεῖς ἀφίκαμεν πάντες, 26. 5. 6. ποτε οὐ μνησθῆται πῶς ἀφίσε αὐτῶν ἔργον. And in this acception it cannot explicate unto us what is the true notion of ἀφίνα ἀφίσταται. Fourthly, it is taken for emittente, as Matt. 23. 23. καὶ ἀφίκατε τὰ βαρύνετα τῶ νόμου, and Luc. 11. 42. ταῦτα ἐφίποινα, καλέω καὶ μὴ ἀφίκα, and yet we have nothing to our present purpose. But fifthly it is often taken for remittere, and that particularly in relation to a debt, as Matt. 18. 27. τοῦ δαμενοῦ ἀφίκα αὐτῷ. and vers. 32. πάντω τῷ δαμένῳ ἐκείνῳ ἀφίκα σοι. Which acception is most remarkable in the year of release, Deut. 15. 1. 2. Δι' ἐπὶ ἑξήμιτις ποιήσεις ἀφισιν. Καὶ ὅτω τοῦ σκευαγμοῦ τῶ ἀφίστου. ἀφισιν πάντες ἱδοὺ δόρεται σοι ὁ πλησίον, καὶ ὁ ἀδελφὸς σου ὁ ἀπαιτήσις, ἐπικέλει. καὶ ἀφισιν Κωίω τῷ Θεῷ. Now this remission or release of debts hath a great affinity with remission of sins; for Christ himself hath conjoynd these two together, and called our sins by the name of debts, and promised remission of sins to us by God, upon our remission of debts to man. And therefore be hath taught us thus to pray, Ἀφισ ἡμῖν τῷ δαμένῳ καὶ ἡμῶς, ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀφίκαμεν τοῖς δαμένῳ καὶ ἡμῶς, Matt. 6. 11. Besides he hath not only made use of the notion of debt, but any injury done unto a man, he calls a sin against man, and exhorteth to forgive those sins committed against us, that God may forgive the sins committed by us, which are injuries done to him, Luke 17. Ἐάν ποτε τις εἰς ἐσὶ Ἀδελφός σου, ἐπιτίμωσεν αὐτῷ, καὶ εἰς μεμάρηται, ἀφισ αὐτῷ.

For although the word signifying *Remission* have one sense among many other which may seem proper for this particular concernment, yet because the same word hath been often used to signify the same action of God in forgiving sins, where it could have no such particular motion, but several times hath * another signification tending to the same effect, and as proper to the remission of sins, therefore I conceive the nature of *forgiveness of sins* is rather to be understood by the consideration of all such ways and means which were used by God in the working and performing of it, then in this, or any other word which is made use of in expressing it.

* We must not
only look upon
the propriety
of the words
used in the
New Testa-
ment, but we
must also re-

fixed upon their use in the Old, especially in such subjects as did belong unto the Old Testament as well as the New. Now ἀφίεναι ἀφί-
 ντας is there used for the Verb כָּפַר, as Isa. 22. 14. : כָּפַר לָכֵן עַד מוֹתוֹ; Οὐκ ἀφεσθῆναι ὕμιν
 αὐτῇ ἡ ἀφίεναι εἰς ἀν. σου δέχεται, Sometimes for the Verb נָשָׂא as Gen. 50. 17. : וְשָׂא אֶת־פְּשָׁעֵי אֲבוֹתָיִךְ וְאֶת־פְּשָׁעֵי
 אֲבוֹתָיִךְ תָּשֵׂא אֲשֶׁר נָשָׂא פָשַׁע אֲשֶׁר נָשָׂא פָשַׁע. Psal. 25. 18. : וְשָׂא אֶת־כָּל־חַטֹּאתַי. And in
 that remarkable place, which S. Paul made use of to declare the nature of Remission, of sins, Psal. 32. 1. : אֲשֶׁר נָשָׂא פָשַׁע. μακάριος
 ὁ ἄνθρωπος αἰ ἀφίενται. Sometimes it is taken for חָלַס as Num 14. 19. : חָלַס נָשָׂא לָכֵן הָיָה הָעָם הוּא. ἀφίεναι τὴν ἀφίενται
 τὸ λαὸν τὸν, Lev. 4. 20. : וְנִסְחָלוּ לָהֶם. ἀφίενται αὐτοῖς ἡ ἀφίενται. Now being ἀφίεναι variation to sins, is used
 for כָּפַר, signifying expiation, at reconciliation; for נָשָׂא, signifying elevation, portation or ablation; for חָלַס signifying
 pardon and indulgence; we cannot argue from the word alone, that God in forgiving sins doth only and barely release the debt.
 There is therefore no force to be laid upon the words ἀφίεναι ἀφίενται, Remissio peccatorum, or, as the Ancient Fathers, Remissio
 peccatorum. So Tertullian, Diximus de remissio peccatorum, adv. Marcion. lib. 4. cap. 18. S. Cyprian Epist. 14. Qui blasphemavit
 in Spiritum Sanctum non habet remissionem, sed reus est æterni peccati. Idem de Bono Patient. Dominus baptizatur à
 servo, & remissionem peccatorum daturus, ipse non dignatur lavacro regenerationis corpus abluere. Idem lib. 3. Epist. 8. of an
 infant, Qui ad remissionem peccatorum recipiendum hoc ipso facilius accedit, quod illi remittuntur non propria sed aliena peccata.
 Adds the Interpreter of Irenæus concerning Christ, Remissionem peccatorum existentem his qui credunt in eum.

Now that we may understand what was done toward the remission of sins, that from thence we may conclude what is done in it: it is first to be observed, that *† almost all things by the law were purged with blood, and without shedding of blood there is no remission.* And what was then legally done, was but a type of that which was to be performed by *Christ*; and therefore the blood of *Christ* must necessarily be involved in the remission of sins; for he ** once in the end of the world hath appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself.* It must then be acknowledged, and can be denied by none, that *Christ* did suffer a painful and a shameful death, as we have formerly described it; that the death which he endured, he did then suffer for sin; for *this man*, saith the

† Heb. 9.22.
 χωεῖς αἵμα-
 τεκχυσίας ἔ-
 γινεῖ ἁγίας

* Heb. 9.26.
It is not only
ἀφεσις, but
ἀντίστασις ἀ-
ντὶ ἡμῶν.

Heb. 10. 12.

1 Pet. 3. 18.

Heb. 7. 26.

Isa. 53. 5.

Rom. 4. 25.

Gal. 1. 4.

1 Cor. 15. 3.

Isa. 53. 5.

2 Cor. 5. 21.

Isa. 53. 5.

Matt. 26. 28.

Ephes. 1. 7.

Apostle, offered one sacrifice for sins; that the sins for which he suffered were not his own, for *Christ hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust*; he was holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners, and therefore had no sin to suffer for; that the sins for which he suffered, were ours, for *he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities*; He was delivered for our offences, he gave himself for our sins, he died for our sins according to the Scriptures; that the dying for our sins was suffering death as a punishment taken upon himself to free us from the punishment due unto our sins: for God laid on him the iniquity of us all, and made him to be sin for us who knew no sin: he hath born our griefs and carried our sorrows, the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes are we healed; that by the suffering of this punishment to free us from the punishment due unto our sins it cometh to pass that our sins are forgiven, for, *This is my blood, saith our Saviour, of the New Testament, (or Covenant,) which is shed for many for the remission of sins. In Christ we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins according to the riches of his grace.*

In which deduction or series of truths we may easily perceive that *the forgiveness of sins*, which is promised unto us, which we upon that promise do believe, containeth in it a Reconciliation of an offended God, and a Satisfaction unto a just God; it containeth a reconciliation, as without which God cannot be conceived to remit; it comprehendeth a Satisfaction, as without which God was resolved not to be reconciled.

For the first of these, We may be assured of forgiveness of sins, because *Christ* by his death hath reconciled God unto us, who was offended by our sins; and that he hath done so, we are assured; because he which before was angry with us, upon the consideration of *Christ's* death, becomes propitious unto us, and did ordain *Christ's* death to be a propitiation for us. For we are justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in *Jesus Christ*, whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood. We have an advocate with the Father, and he is the propitiation for our sins. For God loved us and sent his Son to be a propitiation for our sins. It is evident therefore that *Christ* did render God propitious unto us by his blood, (that is, his sufferings unto death) who before was offended with us for our sins. And this propitiation amounted to a reconciliation, that is, a kindness after wrath. We must conceive that God was angry with mankind before he determined to give our Saviour; we cannot imagine that God who is essentially just, should not abominate iniquity. The first affection we can conceive in him upon the lapse of man, is wrath and indignation. God therefore was most certainly offended before he gave a Redeemer, and though it be most true, that he *so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son*; yet there is no incongruity in this, that a Father should be offended with that Son which he loveth, and at that time offended with him when he loveth him. Notwithstanding therefore that God loved men whom he created, yet he was offended with them when they sinned, and gave his Son to suffer for them, that through that Son's obedience he might be reconciled to them.

This Reconciliation is clearly delivered in the Scriptures as wrought by *Christ*; For all are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself by *Jesus Christ*; and that by virtue of his death, for *when we were enemies we were reconciled unto God by the death of his Son, making peace through the blood of his cross, and by him reconciling all things unto himself.* In vain it is objected that the Scripture saith our Saviour reconciled men to God, but no where teacheth that he reconciled God to man; for in the language of the Scripture to reconcile a man to God, is in our vulgar language to reconcile God to man, that is to cause

2 Cor. 5. 18.

Rom. 5. 10.

Col. 1. 20.

cause him who before was angry and offended with him to be gracious and propitious to him. As the Princes of the *Philistines* spake of *David*, *Where- with should he reconcile himself unto his Master? should it not be with the heads of these men?* wherewith shall he reconcile *Saul* who is so highly offended with him, wherewith shall he render him gracious and favourable but by betraying these men unto him; As our Saviour adviseth, *If thou bring thy gift before the Altar, and there remembreth that thy brother hath ought against thee, leave there thy gift before the altar, and goe thy way, first be reconciled to thy brother*, that is, reconcile thy brother to thy self, whom thou hast injured, render him by thy submission favourable unto thee, who hath something against thee, and is offended with thee. As the Apostle adviseth the wife that *departeth from her husband, to remain unmarried, or to be reconciled to her husband*, that is, to appease and get the favour of her husband. In the like manner we are said to be reconciled unto God, when God is reconciled, appeased and become gracious and favourable unto us, and *Christ* is said to reconcile us unto God, when he hath moved, and obtained of God to be reconciled unto us, when he hath appeased him and restored us unto his favour. Thus *when we were enemies we were reconciled to God*, that is notwithstanding he was offended with us for our sins, we were restored unto his favour, *by the death of his Son*.

Whence appeareth the weakness of the Socinian exception, that in the Scriptures † we are said to be reconciled unto God, but God is never said to be reconciled unto us. For by that very expression, it is understood, that he which is reconciled in the language of the Scriptures, is restored unto the favour of him who was formerly offended with that person which is now said to be reconciled. As when *David* was to be reconciled unto *Saul*, it was not that *David* should lay down his enmity against *Saul*, but that *Saul* should become propitious and favourable unto *David*: and therefore where the language is that *David* should be reconciled unto *Saul*, the sense is, that *Saul*, who was exasperated and angry, should be appeased and so reconciled unto *David*.

ejus finis reconciliati, vel Deo reconciliati; ut ex omnibus locis quæ de reconciliatione agunt videre est, *Cat. Rac. c. 8. To this may be added the Observation of Socinus. Ita communem ferre loquendi consuetudinem, ut scilicet is reconciliatus fuisse dicatur, per quem stabat ne amicitia aut denuo existeret, aut conservaretur: de Christo Servatone, p. 1. c. 8. Which observation is most false, as appeareth in the case of Saul and David, and in the person mentioned in the Gospel, who is commanded to be reconciled unto him whom he had offended, and who had something against him.*

Nor is it any wonder God should be thus reconciled to sinners by the death of *Christ*, who *while we were yet sinners died for us*, because the punishment which *Christ*, who was our Surety, endured, was a full satisfaction to the will and justice of God. *The Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.* Now a ransom is a price given to redeem such as are any way in captivity; any thing laid down by way of compensation, to take off a bond or obligation, whereby he which before was bound becometh free. All sinners were obliged to undergoe such punishments as are proportionate to their sins, and were by that obligation captivated and in bonds, and *Christ* did give his life a ransom for them, and that a proper ransom, if that his life were of any price, and given as such. For a ransom is properly nothing else but something of * price given by way of redemption, to buy or purchase that which is detained, or given for the releasing of that which is intralled. But it is most evident that the life of *Christ* was laid down as a price, neither is it more certain that he died, then that

1 Sam. 29. 4.
Εν τῇ δια-
λογίᾳ τῇ
ἐν τῷ κρεί-
σσῳ; ὅτι ἐν
τῇ καρδίᾳ
ἀνδρῶν ἐκεί-
νων; ἢ ἂν
acceptum se
reddet, ita se-
getur ut Saul
eum in gratiā
recipere ve-
lit.

* Matt. 5. 23;
24.
Πρῶτον δι-
αλλάγητι
τὸ ἀδελφόν
σου.

1 Cor. 7. 11.
Rom. 5. 10.

† Ad hæc ve-
ro quod nos
Deo reconci-
liari quid
affert? Pri-
mum, nus-
quam Scri-
pturam asse-
rere, Deum
nobis a Chri-
sto reconci-
liatum, ve-
rum id tan-
tum quod nos
per Christum
aut mortem

* Matt. 20. 28
Δόναι τινα
λύτρον αὐτῶν
πολλῶν. What
is the true no-
tion of λύ-
τρον, will ea-
sily appear, be-
cause both the
originatio
and use of the
word is suffi-
ciently known.
The origina-
tion is from
λύειν solvere;

to lose, λύτρον quasi λύτρεον. Etym. Ὁρέσθαι τὰ ἀρετήσια, ὡς τὰ λύτρα τὰ λυτρία. Eustath. Λύγει δὲ Ὁρέσθαι (ita leg.) τὰ ποσεία ἐν τῷ ἀρετήσια καὶ λυτρίων, ὡς λυτρία λύτρα, σωθῆναι σώτρα, Illud δ. Λύτρον igitur quicquid datur ut quis solvatur.

foiatur. Ἐπὶ αἰχμαλώτων ἐξαγοστής οἰκείον τὸ λύειν * ὅθεν καὶ λύτρα τὰ δῶκε λέγονται τὰ εἰς τοιοῦτο δίδωμι, Euseb. ad Hieron. upon that of Homer Iliad. α'. Αὐτοῦ μὲν δὲ δῶκεν ἄνδρα. It is properly spoken of such things as are given to redeem a captive, or recover a man into a free condition. Hesych. πάντα τὰ δίδωμι εἰς ἀντάληψιν ἀνθρώπων, (so I read it, not ἀντάληψιν.) So that whatsoever is given for such a purpose is λύτρον, and whatsoever is not given for such an end deserveth not that name in Greek. As the City Antandrus was so called because it was given in exchange for a man who was a captive. Ὁπ' Ἀνδάνῳ αἰχμαλῶτι ἐρρύσθη ἡ πόλις Πελασγῶν καὶ αὐτὸν αὐτὸν τὴν πόλιν δίδωκε λύτρα, καὶ ἀπελύθη. Etym. So that there can be nothing more proper in the Greek language than the words of our Saviour, δῶκεν τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀπὸ πολλῶν * δῶκεν λύτρον, for λύτρον is τὸ δίδωμι, and ἀπὸ πολλῶν, for it is given ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπων, as that city was called Ἀντανδρῶν, ἢ γὰρ ἀπὸ ἀνδρὸς δεδωμένη. And therefore 1 Tim. 2.6. it is said, ὁ δὲ θεὸς ἐαυτὸν ἀντίλυτρον ἵκεν πάντων. * Hesych. Λύτρον, τιμήματα.

1 Cor. 6. 20. he bought us; *Ye are bought with a price*, saith the Apostle, and it is the Lord who bought us, and the price which he paid was his blood, for we are not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, but with the precious blood of Christ. Now as it was the blood of Christ, so was it a price given by way of compensation; and as that blood was precious, so was it a full and perfect satisfaction. For as the gravity of the offence and iniquity of the sin is augmented, and encreaseth, according to the dignity of that which is given by way of compensation, is raised according to the dignity of the person offended and injured by it, so the value, price and dignity of the person making the satisfaction. God is of infinite Majesty, against whom we have sinned, and Christ is of the same divinity, who gave his life a ransom for sinners; for God hath purchased his Church with his own blood. Although therefore God be said to remit our sins by which we were captivated, yet he is never said to † remit the price without which he had never been redeemed: neither can he be said to have remitted it, because he did require it and receive it.

† As λύτρον is a certain price given or promised for liberty, so ἀφίναμι λύτρον is to remit the price set upon the head of any man or promised for him. As we read in the Testament of Lyon the Philosopher. Δημητρίῳ μὲν ἐλδ' ἑστὶν πάλαι ὄντι ἀφίναμι τὸ λύτρον. Demetrius had been his servant, and he had set him free upon a certain price which he had engaged himself to pay for that liberty, the summe which Demetrius was thus bound to pay Lyon at his death remits; as also to Criton. Κρίτωνι δὲ Καρχηδονίῳ, καὶ τέτρωτα λύτρα ἀφίναμι. Diog. Laert.

If then we consider together, on our side the nature and obligation of sin, in Christ the satisfaction made, and reconciliation wrought, we shall easily perceive how God forgiveth sins, and in what remission of them consisteth. Man being in all conditions under some law of God, who hath Sovereign power and dominion over him, and therefore owing absolute obedience to that law, whensoever any way he transgresseth that law, or deviateth from that rule, he becomes thereby a sinner, and contracteth a guilt which is an obligation to endure a punishment proportionable to his offence; and God who is the Law-giver and Sovereign, becoming now the party wronged and offended, hath a most just right to punish man as an offender. But Christ taking upon him the nature of man, and offering himself a sacrifice for sin, giveth that unto God for and in stead of the eternal death of man, which is more valuable and acceptable to God than that death could be, and so maketh a sufficient compensation and full satisfaction for the sins of man; which God accepting, becometh reconciled unto us, and for the punishment which Christ endured, taketh off our obligation to eternal punishment.

Thus man who violated by sinning the law of God, and by that violation offended God, and was thereby obliged to undergo the punishment due unto the sin, and to be inflicted by the wrath of God, is, by the price of the most precious

cious blood of *Christ*, given and accepted in full compensation and satisfaction, for the punishment which was due, restored unto the favour of God, who being thus satisfied, and upon such satisfaction reconciled, is faithful and just to take off all obligation unto punishment from the sinner; and in this act of God consisteth *the forgiveness of sins*. Which is sufficient for the first part of the explication of this Article, as being designed for nothing else but to declare what is the true notion of *Remission of Sins*, in what that action doth consist.

The second part of the Explication, taking notice not onely of the substance, but also of the Order of the Article, observing the Immediate connexion of it with the *Holy Church*, and the relation, which in the opinion of the Ancients it hath unto it, will endeavour to instruct us how this great Privilege of *forgiveness of sins* is propounded in the Church, how it may be procured and obtained by the members of the Church.

At the same time when our Saviour sent the Apostles to gather a Church unto him, he foretold that *repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations beginning at Jerusalem*; and when the Church was first constituted, they thus exhorted those whom they desired to come into it, *Repent and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, and, Be it known unto you that through this man is preached unto you forgiveness of sins*. From whence it appeareth that the *Jews and Gentiles* were invited to the Church of *Christ*, that they might therein receive remission of sins; that the doctrine of remission of all sins propounded and preached to all men, was proper and peculiar to the Gospel, which teacheth us that by *Christ* all that believe are justified from all things, from which they could not be justified by the law of *Moses*. Therefore *John* the Baptist, who went before the face of the Lord to prepare his ways, gave knowledge of salvation unto his people by the remission of their sins. Luk 24. 47.
Acts 3. 29.
13. 38.
Acts 13. 39.

This, as it was preached by the Apostles at the first gathering of the Church of *Christ*, I call proper and peculiar to the Gospel, because the same doctrine was not so propounded by the Law. For if we consider the Law it self strictly and under the bare notion of a Law, it promised life onely upon perfect, absolute, and uninterrupted obedience; the voice thereof was onely this, *Do this and live*. Some of the greater sins nominated and specified in the law, had annexed unto them the sentence of death, and that sentence irreversible; nor was there any other way or means left in the law of *Moses* by which that punishment might be taken off. As for other less and more ordinary sins, there were sacrifices appointed for them, and when those sacrifices were offered and accepted, God was appeased, and the offences were released. Whatsoever else we reade of sins forgiven under the law, was of some special divine indulgence, more then was promised by *Moses*, though not more then was promulgated unto the people, in the name and of the nature of God, so far as something of the Gospel was mingled with the Law.

Now as to the atonement made by the Sacrifices, it clearly had relation to the death of the *Messias*, and whatsoever virtue was in them did operate through his death alone. As he was the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world, so all atonements which were ever made, were onely effectual by his blood. But though no sin was ever forgiven but by virtue of that satisfaction, though God was never reconciled unto any sinner but by intuition of that propitiation, yet the general doctrine of remission of sins was never clearly revealed, and publicly preached to all nations till the coming of the Saviour of the world, whose name was therefore called *Jesus*, because he was to save his people from their sins.

Being therefore we are assured that the preaching Remission of sins belongeth

longeth not onely certainly, but in some sense peculiarly, to the Church of *Christ*, it will be next considerable how this Remission is conferred upon any person in the Church.

For a full satisfaction in this particular two things are very observable, one relating to the Initiation, the other concerning the Continuation of a Christian. For the first of these, it is the most General and irrefragable Assertion of all, to whom we have reason to give credit, that all sins whatsoever any person is guilty of, are remitted in the Baptism of the same person. For the second, it is as certain that all sins committed by any person after baptism, are remissible, and the person committing those sins, shall receive forgiveness upon true Repentance at any time, according to the Gospel.

First, it is certain that *Forgiveness of Sins* was promised to all who were baptized in the name of *Christ*; and it cannot be doubted but all persons who did perform all things necessary to the receiving the ordinance of Baptism, did also receive the benefit of that Ordinance, which is *remission of sins*. *John* did baptize in the wilderness and preach the Baptism of repentance for the remission of sins. And *S. Peter* made this the exhortation of his first Sermon, *Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins*. In vain doth doubting and fluctuating *Socinus* endeavour to evacuate the evidence of this Scripture; attributing the Remission either to Repentance without consideration of Baptism, or else to the publick Profession of Faith made in Baptism; or if any thing must be attributed to Baptism it self, it must be nothing but a declaration of such remission. For how will these shifts agree with that which *Ananias* said unto *Saul*, without any mention either of Repentance or Confession, *Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins*, and that which *S. Paul*, who was so baptized, hath taught us concerning the Church, that *Christ* doth *sanctifie and cleanse it with the washing of water*? It is therefore sufficiently certain that Baptism as it was instituted by *Christ* after the preadministration of *S. John*, wheresoever it was received with all qualifications necessary in the person accepting, and conferred with all things necessary to be performed by the person administering, was most infallibly efficacious, as to this particular, that is, to the remission of all sins committed before the administration of this Sacrament.

Mark 1. 1.

Acts 2. 38.

* Vel Baptismo illi hoc est, ablutioni peccatorum Remissionē, nequaquam tribuit Petrus, sed poenitentia; vel si Baptismi quoque rationem ea in re habuit, aut quatenus publicam nominis Jesu Christi professionem continet eam tantum consideravit; aut si ipsius etiam eternae ab-

† *S. Chrysostome speaking of the power of the Priests, εἰς ὅταν ἡμᾶς ἀναβύνοσι μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ πᾶσι ταῦτα ἐν ἡμῶν ἐξουσίᾳ.*

De Sacerd. 3. Exceptio baptismatis munere, quod contra originale peccatum donatum est, (ut quod generatione attractum est regeneratione detrahatur, & tamen activa quoque peccata quaecunque corde, ore, opere commissa invenerit tollit) hac ergo excepta magna indulgentia (unde incipit hominis renovatio) in qua solvitur omnis reatus & ingeneratus & additus, ipsa etiam vita cetera jam ratione utentis ætatis, quantalibet præpolleat fecunditate justitiæ, sine remissione peccatorum non agitur; quoniam filii Dei quamdiu mortaliter vivunt cum morte configunt: & quamvis de illis sit veraciter dictum, *Quot quot Spiritu Dei aguntur, hi filii sunt Dei*: sic tamen Spiritu Dei excitantur, & tanquam filii Dei proficiunt ad Deum, ut etiam spiritu suo (maxime aggravante corruptibili corpore) tanquam filii hominum quibusdam motibus humanis deficiant ad seipsos & peccent, *S. August. Enchir. cap. 44.* Οὐτο καὶ καὶ τὸ βάπτισμα ἐκκαθαίρει τὰ ἁμαρτήματα καὶ πᾶσι πᾶσι καὶ ἁμαρτίαις. Πάντων τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἐξομολογούμενοι, ὥστε αὐτὰ ἐξέλκεται ἐν τῷ ὕδατι, καὶ αἰσχυρὴ καὶ ἡ κοιλία αὐτῶν ἀπακαθαίρεται καὶ ἡ καρδιά αὐτῶν ὡς ὁμοιωμένη τῷ ὕδατι. *S. Chrys. Hom. in Pentecost. 1.* Quod autem scriptum, & sanguis Jesu filii ejus mundat nos ab omni peccato tam in Confessione Baptismatis, quam in clementia pœnitentia accipiendum est. *S. Hieron. adv. Pelag. l. 2.*

and

and for ever seek the favour of God. This then is the comfort of the Gospel, that as it discovereth sin within us, so it propoundeth a remedy unto us. While we are in this life encompassed with flesh, while the allurements of the world, while the stratagems of Satan, while the infirmities and corruptions of our nature betray us to the transgression of the law of God: we are always subject to offend, (from whence, whosoever saith *that he hath no sin is a lyer*, contradicting himself, and contracting iniquity by pretending innocency,) and so long as we can offend, so long we may apply our selves unto God by repentance, and be renewed by his grace, and pardoned by his mercy.

And therefore the Church of God, in which *Remission of sins* is preached, doth not onely promise it at first by the Laver of Regeneration, but afterwards also upon the virtue of Repentance; and to deny the Church this power of Absolution is the * *Heretic of Novatian.*

* I call this
the Heretic of

Novatian, rather then of *Novatus*, because though they both joyned in it, yet it rather sprung from *Novatianus* the Roman Presbyter, then from *Novatus* the African Bishop. And he is thus expressed by *Epiphanius*, λέγων μὴ ἐν ὁμοιοῦσιν, ἀλλὰ μίαν μετανοίαν· ἐν ᾗ τὸ λυτῶν, μὴ κετὶ διώδωκεν ἑλεεινὰ ἀναπαύσασθαι· that is, he acknowledged but one Repentance which was available in Baptism; after which if any man sinned, there was no mercy remaining for him. To which *Epiphanius* gives this reply, Ἡ αὖτε τελεία μετάνοια ἐν τῷ λυτῶν τυγχάνει· εἰ δὲ πρὶς παρέστηεν ἐν ἀπολλῇ τῶν ἡ ἀγία Θεοῦ Ἐκκλησία· δίδωσι γὰρ καὶ ἑπ' αὐτοῖς, καὶ μετὰ τὴν μετάνοιαν τὴν μεταμελείαν· and again, Δεῖξέ μοι ὅπου ὁ ἀγίος καὶ ἡ ἀγία Θεοῦ Ἐκκλησία πάντοτε τὴν μετάνοιαν· and yet more generally, Τὰ πάντα (καὶ οὗτοι τετέλειον) μετὰ τὴν ἐντεταλὴν ἐνδομῆαν, ἐπὶ ᾧ ὄντων ἐν τῷ ἀγίῳ πάντων, καὶ μετὰ τῶν ἐν ἀνάστασις· ἐπὶ ἐλπίς, ἐπὶ ἀρεσκείᾳ, ἐπὶ ὁμολογίᾳ· καὶ εἰ μὴ τελειότατα, ἀλλ' ἐν γὰρ αὐτῶν ἀλλων ἐν ἀπολλῇ· ἡ ὁμοιοῦσιν. Her. 59.

The necessity of the belief of this Article appeareth first, because there can be no Christian consolation without this perswasion. For we have all sinned, and come short of the glory of God, nay, God himself hath concluded all under sin, we must also acknowledge that every sinner is a guilty person, and that guilt consisteth in an obligation to endure eternal punishment from the wrath of God provoked by our sins; from whence nothing else can arise but a fearful expectation of everlasting misery. So long as guilt remaineth on the soul of man, so long is he in the condition of the Devils, *delivered into chains, and reserved unto judgment.* For we all fell as well as they, but with this difference, remission of sins is promised unto us, but to them it is not.

Secondly, it is necessary to believe the *forgiveness of sins*, that thereby we may sufficiently esteem God's goodness and our happiness. When man was fallen into sin, there was no possibility left to him to work out his recovery; that soul which had sinned must of necessity die, the wrath of God abiding upon him for ever. There can be nothing imaginable in that man which should move God not to shew a demonstration of his justice upon him; there can be nothing without him which could pretend to rescue him from the sentence of an offended and Almighty God. Glorious therefore must the goodness of our God appear, who dispenseth with his law, who taketh off the guilt, who looseth the obligation, who not imputeth the sin. This is God's goodness, this is man's happiness. For *blessed is he whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered; blessed is the man unto whom the Lord imputeth no iniquity.* The year of release, the year of Jubilee, was a time of publick joy; and there is no voice like that, *thy sins are forgiven thee.* By this a man is rescued from infernal pains, secured from the everlasting flames; by this he is made capable of heaven, by this he is assured of eternal happiness.

Thirdly, it is necessary to believe the *forgiveness of sins*, that by the sense thereof we may be enflamed with the love of God. For that love doth naturally follow from such a sense, appeareth by the Parable in the Gospel, *There was a certain creditor which had two debtors, the one owed him five hundred pence, the other fifty. And when they had nothing to pay, he frankly forgave them both.*

B b b

both.

both. Upon which case our Saviour made this question, *which of them will love him most?* He supposeth both the debtors will love him, because the creditor forgave them both; and he collecteth the degrees of love will answer proportionably to the quantity of the debt forgiven. We are the debtors, and our debts are sins, and the creditor is God: the remission of our sins is the frank forgiving of our debts, and for that we are obliged to return our love.

Fourthly, the true notion of *forgiveness of sins* is necessary to teach us what we owe to *Christ*, to whom, and how far we are indebted for this forgiveness. *Acts 13. 38.* *Through this man is preached unto us the forgiveness of sins,* and without a surety we had no release. He rendered God propitious unto our persons, because he gave himself as a satisfaction for our sins. While thus he took off our obligation to punishment, he laid upon us a new obligation of obedience. We *1 Cor. 6. 16, 20* *are not our own who are bought with a price: we must glorify God in our bodies* *1 Cor. 7. 22, 23* *and in our spirits, which are God's.* We must be no longer the servants of men, we are the servants of *Christ* who are bought with a price.

Fifthly, it is necessary to believe *remission of sins* as wrought by the blood of *Christ*, by which the Covenant was ratified and confirmed; which mindeth us of a condition required. It is the nature of a Covenant to expect performances on both parts: and therefore if we look for forgiveness promised, we must perform repentance commanded. These two were always preached together, and those which God hath joyned ought no man to put asunder. *Acts 5. 31.* *Christ* did truly appear a Prince and a Saviour, and it was to give repentance to Israel and forgiveness of sins; He joyned these two in the Apostles commission, *Luke 24. 47.* saying, that Repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name throughout all nations.

From hence every one may learn what he is explicitly to believe and confess in this Article of *forgiveness of sins*; for thereby he is conceived to intend thus much, I doe freely and fully acknowledge, and with unspeakable comfort embrace this as a most necessary and infallible truth, that whereas every sin is a transgression of the law of God, upon every transgression there remaineth a guilt upon the person of the transgressor, and that guilt is an obligation to endure eternal punishment, so that all men being concluded under sin they were all obliged to suffer the miseries of eternal death, it pleased God to give his Son, and his Son to give himself to be a surety for this debt, and to release us from these bonds; and because without shedding of blood there is no remission, he gave his life a sacrifice for sin, he laid it down as a ransom, even his precious blood as a price by way of compensation and satisfaction to the will and justice of God, by which propitiation God who was by our sins offended, became reconciled, and being so, took off our obligation to eternal punishment, which is the guilt of our sins, and appointed in the Church of *Christ* the Sacrament of Baptism for the first remission, and Repentance for the constant forgiveness of all following trespasses; and thus *I believe the forgiveness of sins.*

ARTICLE XI.

The Resurrection of the Body.

THIS Article was anciently delivered and acknowledged † by all Churches, onely with this difference, that whereas in other places it was expressed in general terms, *the Resurrection of the flesh*, they of the Church of *Aquileia* by the addition of a pronoun propounded it to every single Believer in a more particular way of expression, *the Resurrection of this flesh*. And though we have translated it in our English Creed, *the Resurrection of the body*; yet neither the Greek nor Latine ever delivered this Article in those terms, but in these, *the * Resurrection of the flesh*; because there may be ambiguity in the one, in relation to the celestial and spiritual bodies, but there can be no collusion in the other. Onely it will be necessary, for shewing our agreement with the Ancient Creeds, to declare that as by *flesh* they understood the body of man, and not any other flesh, so we, when we translate it *body*, understand no other *body* but such a body of flesh, of the same nature which it had before it was by death separated from the Soul. And this we may very well and properly doe, because our Church hath already taken care therein, and given us a fit occasion so to declare our selves. For though in the Creed it self, used at Morning and Evening Prayer, the Article be thus delivered, [*the Resurrection of the body*] yet in the Form of Publick Baptism, where it is propounded by way of question to the God-fathers, in the name of the child to be baptised, it runneth thus [*Doeſt thou believe ... the resurrection of the flesh?*] We see by daily experience, that all men are mortal, that the body left by the soul, the salt and life thereof, putrifieth and consumeth, and according to the sentence of old, returneth unto dust; but these bodies, as frail and mortal as they are, consisting of this corruptible flesh, are the subject of this Article, in which we profess to believe *the Resurrection of the body*.

resurrectionem, uno addito pronomine tradit, *hujus carnis resurrectionem*, Id in Symb. Sive ergo corpus resurrecturum dicimus, secundum Apostolum dicimus, (hoc enim nomine usus est) sive carnem dicimus, secundum traditionem Symboli confitemur. Idem Prol. in Apolog. Pambili. * The Greeks always, *Καρὸς ἀνάστασις*, the Latines, *Carnis resurrectionem*. And this was to be observed because, being we read of spiritual bodies, some would acknowledge the resurrection of the body, who would deny the resurrection of the flesh. Of this S. Jerome gives an account, and withall of the words of the Creed. Exempli causa pauca subjiciam, *credimus*, inquit, *resurrectionem futuram corporum*. Hoc si bene dicatur, pura confessio est; sed quia corpora sunt coelestia, & terrestria, & aer iste & aura tenuis juxta naturam suam corpora nominantur, corpus ponunt, non *carnem*, ut Orthodoxus corpus audiens carnem putet, Hæreticus spiritum recognoscat. Hæc enim eorum est prima decipula; quæ si deprehensa fuerit, instruunt alios dolos, & innocentiam simulant, & malitiosos, nos vocant, & quasi simpliciter credentes aiunt, *Credimus resurrectionem carnis*. Hoc vero cum dixerint, vulgus indoctum putat, sibi sufficere, maxime quia idipsum & in Symbolo creditur. Ep. 55. ad Pam. & Occam.

† Cum omnes Ecclesie ita sacramentum Symboli tradant, ut postquam dixerant peccatorum remissionem, addant *carnis resurrectionem*; sancta Aquileensis Ecclesia, ubi tradit *carnis resurrectionem*, addit unius pronominis syllabam; & pro eo quod cæteri dicunt, *carnis resurrectionem*, nos dicimus, *hujus carnis resurrectionem*. Ruffin. Apol. advers. Hier. Satis cauta & provida adjunctione fidem Symboli Ecclesie nostra docet, quæ in eo quod à cæteris traditur, *carnis*

When we treated concerning the Resurrection of *Christ*, we † delivered the proper notion and nature of the Resurrection in General, that from thence we might conclude that our Saviour did truly rise from the dead. Being now to explain the Resurrection to come, we shall not need to repeat what we then delivered, or make any addition as to that particular, but referring the Reader to that which is there explained, it will be necessary for us onely to consider what is the Resurrection to come, who they are which shall be raised, how we are assured they shall rise, and in what manner all shall be performed. And this Resurrection hath some peculiar difficulties different from those which might seem to obstruct the belief of *Christ's* Resurrection. For the body of the Son of God did never see corruption; all the parts thereof

† Pag. 254

continued in the same condition in which they were after his most precious soul had left them, they were onely deposited in the Sepulchre, otherwise the grave had no power over them. But other mortal bodies, after the soul hath deserted them, are left to all the sad effects of their mortality; we may say to corruption, *Thou art my Father, to the worm, thou art my Mother and my Sister*; our corps go down to the barrs of the pit, and rest together in the dust. Our death is not a simple dissolution, not a bare separation of soul and body as *Christ's* was, but our whole Tabernacle is fully dissolved, and every part thereof crumbled into dust and ashes, scattered, mingled and confounded with the dust of the earth. There is a description of a kind of Resurrection in the Prophet *Ezekiel*, in which there is supposed, a valley full of bones, and there was a noise, and behold a shaking, and the bones came together, bone to his bone, the sinews and the flesh came up upon them, and the skin covered them above, and their breath came into them, and they lived and stood upon their feet. But in the resurrection to come we cannot suppose the bones in the valley, for they are dissolved into dust as well as the other parts.

Ezek. 37. 1-7, 8, 10.

We must therefore understand to shew that the bodies of men howsoever corrupted, wheresoever in their parts dispersed, how long soever dead, shall hereafter be recollected in themselves, and united to their own souls. And for the more facile and familiar proceeding in this so highly concerning truth, I shall make use of this method; First to prove, that such a Resurrection is not in it self impossible. Secondly, to shew that it is upon general considerations highly probable. Thirdly, to demonstrate that it is upon Christian principles infallibly certain. It is not in it self impossible, therefore no man can absolutely deny it; it is upon natural and moral grounds highly probable, therefore all men may rationally expect it; it is upon Evangelical principles infallibly certain, therefore all Christians must firmly believe it.

* *Phry* reskoning up those things which he thought not to be in the power of God, mentions these two, mortales æternitate donare, aut revocare defunctos, l. 2. c. 7. And *Aeschylus*, though a Pythagorean, yet absolutely denies it to be in the power of God, for so he makes *Apollo* speak to the *Eumenides*,

First, I confess * *Philosophers* of old did look upon the Resurrection of the body as impossible, and though some of them thought the souls of the dead did live again, yet they never conceived that they were united to the same

Πίδαι δ' αὖ ἀν' λύσσειν, ἔστι τὸ δ' ἀκθῆ,
καὶ χάρτα πολλὰ μυχῶν λυτῆι.
Ἄνδρες δ' ἐπειδὴ αἰμ' ἀναστήσῃ νότις
Ἄπαρ θανάτῳ, ἔστι ἔσ' ἀνάστασις.
Τῶν ἐπεὶ δὲ ἐκείνοις πατὴρ
οὐκ ἔστι, τὰ δ' ἄλλα πάντα ἄνω τ' ἔχοντο
Σοφίαν τι θένον, ἵδεν ἀδύνατον ἔσθαι.

Aeschyl. Eumenid.

Uti anima interire dicatur, ab Epicureis observatur: Ut carnis restitutio negetur, de una omnium Philosophorum schola sumitur, *Tertull.*

bodies, and that their flesh should rise out of the dust that it might be conjoined to the Spirit of a man. We reade of certain *Philosophers* of the *Epicureans* and of the *Stoicks*, who encountered *S. Paul*, and when they heard of the resurrection they mocked him, some saying, that he seemed to be a setter forth of strange Gods, because he preached unto them *Jesus* and the Resurrection. But as the ancient *Philosophers* thought a Creation impossible, because they looked onely upon the constant works of nature, among which they never find any thing produced out of nothing, and yet we have already proved a Creation not onely possible, but performed; so did they think a Resurrection of corrupted, dissolved and dissipated bodies to be as impossible, because they could never observe any action or operation in nature, which did or could produce any such effect; and yet we being not tied to the consideration of nature onely, but estimating things possible and impossible by the power of God,

Acts. 17. 18.

God, will easily demonstrate that there is no impossibility that the dead should rise.

For, if the Resurrection of the dead be impossible, it must be so in one of these respects: either in reference to the Agent, or in relation to the Patient; either because it is a work of so much difficulty that there neither is nor can be any Agent of wisdom, power, and activity sufficient to effect it; or else because the soul of man is so far separated by death from the body, and the parts of the body so much dissolved from themselves and altered from their nature, that they are absolutely incapable by any power to be united as they were. Either both or one of these two must be the reason of the impossibility, if the Resurrection be impossible; for if the body be capable of being raised, and there be any Agent of sufficient ability to raise it, the resurrection of it must be possible.

Now if the Resurrection were impossible in respect of the Agent which should effect it, the impossibility must arise * either from an insufficiency of knowledge or of power; for if either the Agent know not what is to be done, or if he know it, but hath no power to do it, either he will not attempt it, or if he do, must fail in the attempt; but that, of which he hath perfect knowledge, and full power to effect, cannot be impossible in relation to the Agent endued with such knowledge, armed with such power.

* Το ἀδύνατον πρὸς τὴν γνώσκειν καὶ ἀλλήθεναι τοῦτον, ἢ ἐκ τῆς μὴ γνώσκουσαν τὸ γινώσκον, ἢ ἐκ τῆς δύναμιν ἀρκούντων

οὐ μὴ ἔχοντες τὴν ποιῆσαι καλῶς τὸ ἐργασμῶν. Ὅσοι ἀγνοῶν τὴν φύσιν δόντων ἐκ ἀντὶ τῆς ἐξουσίας ἔτε ποιῆσαι τὸ ἀδύνατον δύνασθαι ὅσοι ἀγνοοῦν ὅτε γινώσκον καλῶς τὸ ποιησόμενον καὶ πόθεν ἔχουσιν ἀντὶ τῆς δύναμιν ἢ ἀντὶ ὅλας ἔχουσιν τὸ ποιῆσαι τὸ γινώσκον ἢ μὴ ἀρκούντων ἔχον ἐκ ἀντὶ τῆς ἐξουσίας πᾶσι ἀρχαῖς, εἰ ὡς περὶ τὴν καὶ πᾶσι ἰδίαν ὁμοειδέτην δύναμιν, ἐξουσίας ἢ ἀδύνατον ἐκ ἀντὶ τῆς πᾶσι ἀρχαῖς, Athenagoras de Resurrectione.

Now when we say the Resurrection is possible, we say not it is so to men or Angels or any creature of a limited knowledge or finite power, but we attribute it to God, *with whom nothing is impossible*; his understanding is infinite, he knoweth all the men which ever lived since the foundation, or shall live unto the dissolution of the world, *he knoweth whereof all things are made*, from what *dust* we came, into what *dust* we shall return. *Our substance was not hid from thee, O Lord, when we were made in secret, and curiously wrought in the lowest parts of the earth; thine eyes did see our substance, yet being imperfect, and in thy book were all our members written, which in continuance were fashioned, when as yet there was none of them.* Thus every particle of our bodies, every dust and atome which belongeth to us, is known to him that made us. The Generation of our flesh is clearly seen by the *Father of spirits*, the augmentation of the same is known to him *in whom we live, move, and have our being*; the dissolution of our tabernacles is perceived by that God, by whom the *very hairs of our head are all numbred*, and *without whom one sparrow shall not fall to the ground*. He which numbreth the sands of the Sea, knoweth all the scattered bones, seeth into all the Graves and Tombs, searcheth all the Repositories and Dormitories in the earth, knoweth what dust belongeth to each body, what body to each soul. Again, as his all-seeing eye observeth every particle of dissolved and corrupted man, so doth he also see and know all ways and means by which these scattered parts should be united, by which this ruined fabrick should be recompensed, he knoweth how every bone should be brought to its old neighbour bone, how every sinew may be rebroydered on it; he understandeth what are the proper parts to be conjoyned, what is the proper *gluten* by which they may become united. The Resurrection therefore cannot be impossible in relation to the Agent upon any deficiency of knowledge how to effect it.

Psal. 139.
15, 16.

Matt. 10:
29, 30.

And as the Wisdom is infinite, so the Power of this Agent is illimited; for

God is as much Omnipotent as Omniscient. There can be no opposition made against him, because all power is his; nor can he receive a check against whom there is no resistance. All creatures must not only suffer, but do what he will have them; they are not only passively, but actively obedient. There is no atome of the dust or ashes but must be where it pleaseth God, and be applied and make up what and how it seemeth good to him. The Resurrection therefore cannot be impossible in relation unto God upon any disability to effect it, and consequently there is no impossibility in reference to the Agent, or him who is to raise us.

Secondly, the Resurrection is not impossible in relation to the Patient, because where we look upon the power of God nothing can be impossible but that which involveth a contradiction, as we before have proved; and there can be no contradiction in this, that he which was, and now is not, should hereafter be what before he was. It is so far from a repugnance, that it rather containeth a rational and apparent possibility, that man who was once dust, becoming dust, should become man again. Whatsoever we lose in death is not lost to God: as no creature could be made out of nothing but by him, so can it not be reduced into nothing but by the same: though therefore the parts of the body of man be dissolved, yet they perish not; they lose not their own entity when they part with their relation to humanity; they are * laid up in the secret places, and lodged in the Chambers of nature, and it is no more a contradiction that they should become the parts of the same body of man to which they did belong, then that after his death they should become the parts of any other body, as we see they do. Howsoever they are scattered, or wheresoever lodged, they are † within the knowledge and power of God, and can have no repugnance by their separation to be reunited when and how he pleaseth. The first dust of which man was made, was as far from being flesh, as any ashes now or dust can be; it was only an Omnipotent power which could mould that into an humane body, and breath into the nostrils of it the breath of life. The same power therefore, which must always be, can still make of the dust returning from the bodies of men unto the earth, humane bones and flesh, as well as of the dust which first came from the earth: for if it be not easier, it is most certainly as easie. ∴ to make that to be again which once hath been, as to make that to be which before was not. When there was no man, God made him of the earth, and therefore when he returns to earth, the same God can make him man again. The Resurrection therefore cannot be impossible, which is our first Conclusion.

* Non sola anima seponitur, habet & caro suos si-
gus interim, in aquis, in ignibus, in al-
litibus, in bestiis; cum in hac dis-
solvi videtur, velut in vasa transfun-
ditur, *Tertull. de Resurrectione carnis, c. 68.*
Tu perire Deo credis si
si quid oculis nostris hebe-
ribus subtra-
hitur? Cor-
pus omne sive
arescit in
pulverem, si-

ve in humorem solvitur, vel in cinerem comprimitur, vel in nidorem renatur, subducitur nobis, sed Deo elementorum custodi
reservatur, *Minutius Felix in Octavio.* Omnia quæ dissepuntur, & in favillas quasdam putrescunt, integra Deo sunt, in illa
enim elementa mundi eunt unde primo venerunt, *S. August. in Psalm. Ecdic. 62.*

† Absit autem ut ad resuscitanda corpora vitæque reddenda non possit Omnipotentia Creatoris omnia revocare quæ vel bestia vel ignis absumpsit; vel in pulve-
rem cineremque collapsum, vel in humorem solutum, vel in auras est exhalatum. Absit ut sinus ullus, secretumque naturæ
ita recipiat aliquid subtrahum sensibus nostris, ut omnium Creatoris aut lateat cognitionem, aut effugiat potestatem, *S. August. de Civitate Dei, lib. 22. cap. 29.*

∴. Recogita quid fueris antequam esses, utique nihil. Meminisses enim si quid fuisses. Qui ergo nihil fueras priusquam esses, idem nihil factus non esse desieris, cur non
possis esse rursus de nihilo, ejusdem Authoris voluntate, qui te voluit esse de nihilo? Quid novi tibi eveniet? Qui non eras,
factus es, cum iterum non eris, fies. Redde, si potes, rationem qua factus es, & tunc require qua fies. Et tamen facilius utique
fies quod fuisti aliquando, quia æque non difficile factus es quod nunquam fuisti aliquando, *Tertull. Apolog. c. 43.* Utrique ido-
neus est reficere qui fecit. Quanto plus est fecisse quam refecisse, initium dedisse quam reddidisse; ita restitutionem carnis fa-
ciliorum credas institutione, *Iacobi de Resur. carnis, c. 11.* Difficilius est id quod non sit incipere, quam id quod fuerit iterare,
Minutius Felix in Octavio. Utrique plus est facere quod nunquam fuit, quam reparare quod fuit. Quomodo ergo impossibile
esse dicis, ut Deus qui hominem formavit ex nihilo reformet? Quomodo nos suscitare non potest conversos in pulverem, qui
etiam si in nihilum rediremus, facere poterat ut essemus, sicut effecit nos esse, cum antea nunquam fuisset? *S. Aug. de verbis
Apost. Serm. 19.* To the same purpose the Jews, ; כל שכן

Secondly, the Resurrection is not only in it self possible, so that no man with any reason can absolutely deny it; but it is also upon many general con- siderations highly probable, so that all men may very rationally expect it.

If

If we consider the principles of humanity, the parts of which we all consist, we cannot conceive this present life to be proportionable to our composition. The souls of men as they are immaterial, so they are immortal, and being once created by the Father of spirits they receive a subsistence for eternity; the body is framed by the same God to be a companion for his spirit, and a man born into the world consisteth of these two. Now the life of the most aged person is but short, and many far ignobler creatures of a longer duration. Some of the Souls of the Air, several of the Fishes of the Sea, many of the Beasts of the Field, divers of the Plants of the Earth are of a more durable constitution, and out-live the sons of men. And can we think that such material and mortal, that such inunderstanding souls should by God and nature be furnished with bodies of so long permanſion, and that our spirits should be joyned unto flesh so subject to corruption, so suddenly dissolvable, were it not that they lived but once, and so enjoyed that life for a longer season, and then went soul and body to the same destruction, never to be restored to the same subsistence; but when the soul of man which is immortal is forced from its body in a shorter time, nor can by any means continue with it half the years which many other creatures live, it is because this is not the onely life belonging to the sons of men, and so the soul may at a shorter warning leave the body which it shall resume again.

Again, if we look upon our selves as men, we are free agents, and therefore capable of doing good or evil, and consequently ordinable unto reward or punishment. The Angels who are above us, and did sin, received their punishment without a death, because being only spirits they were subject to no other dissolution then annihilation, which cannot consist with longer suffering punishment; those who continued in their station were rewarded and confirmed for all eternity, and thus all the Angels are incapable of a Resurrection. The creatures which are below us, and for want of freedom cannot sin, or act any thing morally either good or evil, they cannot deserve after this life either to be punished or rewarded, and therefore when they die, they continue in the state of death for ever. Thus those who are above us shall not rise from the dead, because they are punished or rewarded without dying; and where no death is, there can be no resurrection from the dead. Those which are below us, are neither capable of reward or punishment for any thing acted in this life, and therefore though they die, yet shall they never rise, because there is no reason for their Resurrection. But man by the nobleness of his better part being free to doe what is good or evil while he liveth, and by the frailty of his body being subject to death, and yet after that, being capable in another world to receive a reward for what he hath done well, and a punishment for what he hath done ill in the flesh, it is necessary that he should rise from the dead to enjoy the one, or suffer the other. For there is not onely no just Retribution rendred in this life to man, but, considering the ordinary condition of things, it cannot be. For it is possible, and often cometh to pass, .∴ that one man may commit such sins as all the punishments in this life can no way equalize them. It is just, that he who sheddeth man's blood, by man his blood should be shed; but what death can sufficiently retaliate the many murders committed by one notorious Pirate, who may cast many thousands over-board; or the rapines and assassinations of one Rebel or Tyrant, who may destroy whole nations? It is fit that he which blasphemeth God should die; but what equivalent punishment can he receive in this life, who shall constantly blaspheme the name of God, destroy his Priests and Temples, abolish his Worship, and extirpate his Servants? What is then more proper, considering the providence of a most just God, then to believe

∴. Παινημα
 το λεγομεν, οτι
 Καζουδης
 ο φουσαν εν
 η νωι εσωσε
 εθ' η ανθρω-
 ποις ενεγ-
 κειν οιδ' η ο
 Αιμμεδον
 διελω παρ-
 νων η βαρυτι-
 ρων ερεμ-
 νων παρη-
 μελμεδων.
 Athenagoras.

believe that man shall suffer in another life such torments as will be proportionable to his demerits? Nor can we with reason think that the soul alone shall undergo those sufferings, because the laws which were given to us are not made in respect of that alone, but have most frequent reflection on the body, † without which in this life the soul can neither do nor suffer any thing. It is therefore highly probable from the general consideration of humane actions and divine retributions, that there shall be a *Resurrection of the flesh*, that *every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad.*

† Quod congruet iudicari hoc competer etiam resuscitari, Tertullian. de Resurrectione carnis, cap. 14.

Negent operatum societatem ut merito possint mercedem negare. Non sit particeps in sententia caro si non fuerit & in causa. Sola anima revocetur, si sola decedit. At enim non magis sola decedit, quam sola decucurrit illud unde decedit, vitam hanc dico, *Ibid. cap. 15.* Cum omnis vitæ nostræ usus in corporis animæque consortio sit, resurrectio autem aut boni actus præmium habeat aut poenam imarobi, necesse est corpus resurgere cuius actus expenditur. Quomodo enim in iudicium vocabitur sine corpore, cum de suo & corporis contubernio ratio præstanda sit? S. Ambrosij. de Fide Resur. 2 Cor. 5. 10.

Furthermore, beside the principles of which we consist, and the actions which flow from us, the consideration of the things without us, and the natural course of variations in the creature, will render the Resurrection yet more highly probable. Every space of 24 hours teacheth thus much, in which there is always a revolution amounting to a Resurrection. The * day dies into a night, and is buried in silence and in darkness; in the next morning it appeareth again and reviveth, opening the grave of darkness, rising from the dead of night; this is a diurnal Resurrection. As the day dies into night, so doth the Summer into Winter: the sap is said to descend into the root, and there it lies buried in the ground; the earth is covered with snow, or crusted with frost, and becomes a general sepulchre; when the Spring appeareth all begin to rise, the Plants and Flowers peep out of their graves, revive, and grow and flourish; this is the annual Resurrection. The Corn by which we live, and for want of which we perish with famine, is notwithstanding cast upon the earth, and buried in the ground, with a design that it may corrupt, and being corrupted may revive and multiply; our bodies are fed with this constant experiment, and we continue this present life by succession of Resurrections. Thus all things are repaired by corrupting, are preserved by perishing, and revive by dying; and can we † think that man, the Lord of all these things, which thus die and revive for him, should be detained in death as never to live again? Is it imaginable that God should thus restore all things to man, and not restore man to himself? If there were no other consideration, but of the principles of humane nature, of the liberty and remunerability of humane actions, and of the natural revolutions and resurrections of other creatures, it were abundantly sufficient to render the Resurrection of our bodies highly probable.

* Καταγόν-
ον τὴν ἡμέ-
ραν καὶ ἡ-
μέραν καὶ ἡ-
μέραν τὴν ἡμέ-
ραν, πῶς καὶ
αὐτὰ τὴν ἡμέ-
ραν καὶ ἀνίστα-
ται, S. Theoph.
Antioch. ad
Autol. l. 1.

Dies moritur
in noctem, &
tenebris us-
quequaque se-
pelitur. Fu-
nestatur mū-
di honor,
omnis sub-
stantia deni-
gratur. Sor-
dent, silent,
stupent cun-
cta; ubique
justitiam est,
quies rerum:
ita lux amissa
lugetur. Et
tamen rursus
cum suo cul-
tu, cum dote,
cum sole, ca-

dem & integra & tota universo orbi reviviscit, interficiens mortem suam noctem, rescindens sepulturam suam tenebras, hares sibimet existens, donec & nox reviviscat, cum suo & illa suggestu. Redaccenduntur enim & stellarum radii, quos matutina succensio extinxerat. Reducuntur & siderum absentia, quas temporalis distinctio extinxerat. Redornantur & specula Lunæ quæ mensiuus numerus adtriverat, Tertullian. de Resurrectione carnis, cap. 12. Lux quotidie interfecta resplendet, & tenebræ pari vice decedendo succedunt, sidera defuncta viviscunt, tempora ubi finiuntur incipiunt, fructus consummantur & redeunt, Idem. Apol. cap. 48. Διὸς ἡ ἡμέρα καὶ νύξ καὶ ἀνιπτόμενα τὰ τέτραν κοιμισμένων ἀνιπτόμενα, ἀνατρέπει ἡ ἡμέρα ἡμᾶς διμύζου καὶ ἀναστρέφουσαν τὴν ἡμέραν, Epiphani. in Ancorato.

† Omnia pereundo servantur, omnia de interitu re-
formantur. Tu homo, tantum nomen, si intelligas te vel de titulo Pythiæ discens, dominus omnium morientium & resurgentium, ad hoc morieris ut percas? Tertull. Apolog. c. 48. Revolvuntur hyemes & æstates, & verna aut autumnus cum suis viribus, moribus, fructibus. Quippe etiam terræ de cælo disciplina est arbores vestire post spolia, flores denuo colorare, herbas rursus imponere, exhibere eadem quæ absumpta sunt semina, nec prius exhibere quam absumpta: Mira ratio de fraudatrice servatrix, ut reddat interciper, ut custodiat perdit, ut integret vitiat, ut etiam ampliet prius decoquit. Siquidem uberiora & cultiora restituit quam exterminavit: revera senore interitui, & injuria usura, & lucro damno: semel dixerim, omnia de interitu recidiva est. Quodcumque conveneris fuit, quodcumque amiseris nihil non iterum est: omnia in statum redeunt cum abscesserint; omnia incipiunt cum desierint: ideo finiuntur ut fiant, nihil deperit nisi in salutem. Totus igitur hic ordo revolvibilis rerum restitutus est resurrectionis mortuorum. Operibus eam præscripsit Deus antequam literis; viribus prædicavit antequam vocibus. Præstitit tibi Naturam magistratam, submissurus & Prophetiam, quo facilius credas prophetiæ discipulus naturæ; quo statim ad-

mittas

mittas cum audieris, quod ubique jam videris, nec dubites Deum carnis etiam resuscitatore, quem omnium noris restitutore, Et utique omnia homini resurgunt cui procurata sunt: porro non homini nisi & carni, quale est ut ipsa depercat in retum propter quam & cui nihil deperit? *Idem de Resur. carnis cap. 12.*

We must not rest in this School of Nature, nor settle our persuasions upon likelyhoods; but as we passed from an apparent possibility, unto a high presumption and probability, so must we pass from thence unto a full assurance of an infallible certainty. And of this indeed we cannot be assured but by the Revelation of the will of God; upon his power we must conclude that we may, from his will that we shall, rise from the dead. Now the power of God is known unto all men, and therefore all men may infer from thence a possibility; but the will of God is not revealed unto all men, and therefore all have not an infallible certainty of the Resurrection. For the grounding of which assurance, I shall shew that God hath revealed the determination of his will to raise the dead, and that he hath not onely delivered that intention in his Word, but hath also several ways confirmed the same.

Many of the places produced out of the Old Testament to this purpose will scarce amount to a Revelation of this truth. The Jews insist upon such

* weak inferences out of the Law, as shew that the Resurrection was not clearly delivered by Moses; and in the Book of Job, where it is most evidently expressed they acknowledge it not, because they will not understand the true notion of a Redeemer properly belonging to Christ. The words of Job are very express, *I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth, and though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God.* Against the evidence of this truth there are two

Interpretations; one very new of some late Opinionists, who understand this of a sudden restitution to his former temporal condition; the other more ancient of the Jews, who make him speak of the happiness of another life, without any reference to a Resurrection. But that Job spake not concerning any sudden restitution, or any alteration of his temporal condition, is apparent out of the remarkable preface ushering in this expression, *O that my words were now written, O that they were printed in a Book! that they were graven with an iron pen and lead, in the rock for ever!* He desires that his words may continue as his expectation, that they may remain in the rock, together with his hope so long as the rock shall endure, even to the day of his resurrection.

The same appeareth from the objection of his friends, who urged against him that he was a sinner, and concluded from thence that he should never rise again; for his sins he pleadeth a Redeemer, and † for his Resurrection he sheweth expectation and assurance through the same Redeemer. It is further confirmed by the expressions themselves, which are no way proper for his temporal restitution: the first words *I also know*, denote a certainty and community, whereas the blessings of this life are under no such certainty, nor did Job pretend to it, and the particular condition of Job admitted no community, there being none partaker with him of the same calamity; *I know* certainly and infallibly, whatsoever shall become of my body at this time, which I know not, but this I know that I shall rise; this is the hope of all which believe in God, and therefore this * *I also know*. The title which he gives to him on whom he depends, the Redeemer, sheweth that he understands it of

* They produce several places out of Moses, which when the Resurrection is believed may in some kind serve to illustrate it, but can in no degree be thought to reveal so great a mystery. As because in the formation of man Moses useth the word

וַיִּצְרֵם with two iods, & in the formation of beasts וַיִּצְרֵם with but one; therefore the beasts are made but once, but man twice; once in his Generation, and again in his Resurrection. They strangely apprehend a promise of the Resurrection, even in the Malediction.

Dust thou art and to dust thou shalt return; חָלָה לָא

נָאמַר אֱלֹהִים יִשְׂרָאֵל they conclude the Resurrection, upon this ground, שֶׁר לָא נָאמַר אֱלֹהִים יִשְׂרָאֵל, it is not said, he lang, but, he shall ling, viz. after the resurrection in the life to come. With these and the like Arguments did the Rabbins satisfy themselves; which was the reason that they gave so small satisfaction to the Sadduces; while they omitted that pregnant place in Job.

† This place is urged by S. Clemens Romanus, the immediate successor of the Apostles, in his Epistle to the Corinthians, p. 36. where in stead of these words of the LXX, ἀναστήσας τὸ σῶμα με καὶ ἀναστήσας τὸ πνεῦμα, he reads, ὡς ἀναστήσας τὸ σῶμα με καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα, τὸν ἀναστήσας τὸ πνεῦμα με.

As if he had said, thou art now dust while thou livest, and after death thou shalt return unto this dust, that is, thou shalt live again, as now thou dost. So from those words Exod. 15. 1. שֶׁר לָא נָאמַר אֱלֹהִים יִשְׂרָאֵל, it is not said, he lang, but, he shall ling, viz. after the resurrection in the life to come. With these and the like Arguments did the Rabbins satisfy themselves; which was the reason that they gave so small satisfaction to the Sadduces; while they omitted that pregnant place in Job.

Job 19. 25, 26. • • • • •

• • • • •

• • • • •

• • • • •

• • • • •

• • • • •

• • • • •

אחרי *Christ*; the time expressed denotes the futurity at the latter day; the description of that Redeemer, *standing on the earth*, representeth the Judge of the quick and the dead; and, seeing God with his eyes, declares his belief in the Incarnation. The Jewish exposition of future happiness to be conferred by God, fails only in this, that they will not see in this place the promised *Messias*; from whence this future happy condition, which they allow, would clearly involve a Resurrection. Howsoever they acknowledge the words of *Daniel* to declare as much, and many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting confusion.

Dan. 12. 2.

The Jews collected from hence the Resurrection,

as Rabbina

in Sanhedrin,

and in the Midrash Tillim,

Psaln 93. 5.

אחרי *Rabbi Rachmon* said, that the sleepers in the dust are the dead, as it is written, *Dan. 12. 2.* Many

of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, &c.

And this is only denied by the Gentiles; for Porphyrius referreth it

only and wholly to the times of Antiochus, whose words are thus left unto us translated by S. Hierome,

Tunc hi qui quasi in terrae

pulvere dormiebant, & operi erant malorum pondere, & quasi in sepulchris miseriarum reconditi, ad inseparatam victoriam de

terra pulvere resurrexerunt, & de humo elevaverunt caput, custodes legis resurgentes in vitam aeternam, & pravaricatores in

opprobrium sempiternum: where it is to be observed that he gives a probable gloss of the former part of the verse, but none at all of

the latter, because it is no way consistent with his exposition of the former: for they which did rise from the burden of the pressures

under Antiochus, did neither rise from thence to an eternal life, nor to an everlasting contempt. Thou, I say, only the Gentiles did inter-

pret it, but now the Socinians are joined to them. So Volkelius urges, quod in praecedentibus de Antiochi tempore agatur, & re-

surrectionis illa ad tempora quae jam praecesserunt spectet.

If these and other places of the Old Testament shew that God had then revealed his will to raise the dead, we are sure those of the New fully declare the same. *Christ*, who called himself the Resurrection and the life, refuted the Sadduces, and confirmed the doctrine of the Pharisees as to that opinion. He produced a place out of the Law of *Moses*, and made it an Argument to prove as much, *As touching the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not the God of the dead but of the living.* With the force of which Argument the multitude was astonished and the Sadduces silenced. For under the name of God was understood a great benefactor, a God of promise, and to be their God was to bless them and to reward them; as in them to be his servants and his people was to believe in him, and to obey him. Now *Abraham*, *Isaac* and *Jacob* had not received the promises which they expected, and therefore God after their death desiring still to be called their God, he thereby acknowledgeth that he had a blessing and a reward for them still, and consequently that he will raise them to another life in which they may receive it. So that the Argument of our Saviour is the same which the Jews have drawn from another place of *Moses*, *I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob by the name of God Almighty, but by my name of Jehovah was I not known unto them. Nevertheless I have established my Covenant with them, to give them the land of Canaan, the land of their pilgrimage wherein they were strangers.* It is not said, to give their sons, but, to give them the land of Canaan; and therefore, because while they lived here they enjoyed it not, they must live again that they may receive the promise.

Exod. 6. 4.

אמר *לחם*

אמר *לחם*

אמר *לחם*

אמר *לחם*

אמר *לחם*

אמר *לחם*

אמר *לחם*

אמר *לחם*

אמר *לחם*

אמר *לחם*

אמר *לחם*

אמר *לחם*

אמר *לחם*

אמר *לחם*

אמר *לחם*

אמר *לחם*

אמר *לחם*

אמר *לחם*

אמר *לחם*

אמר *לחם*

אמר *לחם*

אמר *לחם*

אמר *לחם*

אמר *לחם*

אמר *לחם*

אמר *לחם*

אמר *לחם*

אמר *לחם*

אמר *לחם*

אמר *לחם*

אמר *לחם*

אמר *לחם*

אמר *לחם*

אמר *לחם*

And as our blessed Saviour did refute the Sadduces out of the Law of *Moses*, so did *S. Paul* joyn himself unto the Pharisees in this particular, for being called before the Council, and perceiving that the one part were Sadduces and the other Pharisees, one denying, the other asserting the Resurrection, he cried unto the Council, *Men and brethren, I am a Pharisee, the son of a Pharisee, of the hope and resurrection of the dead I am called in question*; and answering before *Felix*, that

Acts 23. 6.

that they had found no evil doing in him, while he stood before the Council he mentioned this particularly, except it be for this one vice, that I cried standing among them, Touching the resurrection of the dead I am called in question by you this day. Acts 14.21.

It is evident therefore that the Resurrection of the dead was revealed under the Law, that the Pharisees who sat in Moses chair did collect it thence, and believe it before our Saviour came into the world, that the Sadduces who denied it, erred, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God: that our blessed Saviour clearly delivered the same truth, proved it out of the Law of Moses, refuted the Sadduces, confirmed the Pharisees, taught it the Apostles, who followed him confirming it to the Jews, preaching it to the Gentiles. Thus the will of God concerning the raising the dead was made known unto the Sons of men; and because God can doe whatsoever he will, and will certainly effect whatsoever he hath foretold, therefore we are assured of a Resurrection by virtue of a clear Revelation.

Beside God hath not onely foretold, or barely promised, but hath also given such testimonies as are most proper to confirm our faith in this particular predi-
 ction and promise. For God heard the voice of *Elijah* for the dead child of the widow of *Sarepta*, and the soul of the child came into him again, and he revived. Him did *Elisha* succeed, not onely in the same spirit, but also in the like power, for he raised the child of the *Shunamite* from death; nor did that power die together with him; for when they were burying a dead man, they cast the man into the sepulchre of *Elisha*, and when the man was let down and touched the bones of *Elisha*, he revived and stood upon his feet. These three examples were so many confirmations, under the Law, of a resurrection to life after death; and we have three to equal under the Gospel. When the daughters of *Jairus* was dead, *Christ* said unto her, *Talitha cumi, Damsel arise, and her spirit came again, and straightway the Damsel arose*. When he came nigh to the gate of the city called *Naim*, there was a dead man carried out, and he came nigh, and touched the bier, and said, *Young man, I say unto thee, Arise*; and he that was dead sat up and began to speak. Thus *Christ* raised the dead in the chamber and in the street, from the bed and from the bier, and not content with these smaller demonstrations, proceedeth also from the grave. When *Lazarus* had been dead four dayes, and so buried that his sister said of him, *by this time he stinketh*, *Jesus* cried with a loud voice, *Lazarus come forth*; and he that was dead came forth. These three Evangelical resuscitations are so many preambulatory proofs of the last and general Resurrection; but the three former and these also come far short of the Resurrection of him who raised these. 1 Kings 17. 22.
2 Kings 4.
2 Kings 17. 21.
Mat. 9. 18. 42.
Luke 8. 55.
Luke 7. 12. 14. 15.
John 11. 39. 43. 44.

Christ did of himself actually rise, others who had slept in their graves did come from thence, and thus he gave an actual testimony of the Resurrection. For if *Christ* be preached that he rose from the dead, saith *S. Paul* to the Corinthians, how say some among you that there is no resurrection from the dead? If it be most infallibly certain that one man did rise from the dead, as we have before proved that *Christ* did, then it must be as certainly false to assert that there is no resurrection. And therefore when the Gentiles did themselves confess that some particular persons did return † to life after death, they could not rationally deny the Resurrection wholly. Now the Resurrection of *Christ* doth not onely prove by way of Example, as the rest who rose, but hath a

† There were not onely certain persons under the Law and a

mong the Jews who were raised to life; but there were also Histories amongst the Gentiles of several who rose to life after death. We mentioned before one out of *Plutarch* p. 289. who rose the third day, and *Plato* mentioneth another who revived the twelfth day after death. *Ανδρῶν οὖν οὐκ ὀλίγων ἐστὶν ἃ καὶ ἀλλοίους ἀνδρῶν, ἡδὲ καὶ ἁγίων, τὸ καὶ Παύλου, ὅς ποτε ἐν πόλει τελευτήσας ἀναστάντων διὰ τῶν αὐτῶν νεκρῶν ἡμῶν διαφωτισθῶν, ὅπως αὐτῶν ἀνστήσει, καὶ οὕτως ὅσιν αὐτῶν ἀνστήσει διὰ τῶν αὐτῶν ἐν τῇ πόλει καὶ οὕτως ἀνστήσει. *Plato de Rep. l. 10. vid. l. 1. c. 52. De his qui elati revixerunt.**

force in it to command belief of a future general Resurrection. For God hath appointed a day in which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained, whereof he hath given an assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead. All men then are assured that they shall rise, because Christ is risen. And since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.

This consequence of a future Resurrection of the dead from that of Christ already past, either hath a general or particular consideration. In a general reference it concerneth all; in a more peculiar way it belongeth to the Elect alone. First, it belongeth generally unto all men in respect of that Dominion of which Christ at his resurrection did obtain the full possession and execution. For to this end Christ hath died and rose, and revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and living. Now as God is not the God of the dead, but of the living, so Christ is not the Lord of the dead, as dead, but as by his power he can revive them, and rule them when and in what they live. By virtue of this dominion entred upon at his Resurrection he must reign till he hath put all his enemies under his feet, and the last enemy that shall be destroyed is death, and there is no destruction of death but by a general Resurrection. By virtue of this did he declare himself after this manner to S. John, I am he that liveth and was dead, and behold I am alive for evermore, Amen, and have the keys of hell and of death. Thus are we assured of a general Resurrection, in that Christ is risen to become the Lord of the dead, and to destroy death.

Secondly, Christ rising from the dead assureth us of a General Resurrection in respect of the Judgment which is to follow. For as it is appointed for all men once to die, so after death cometh judgment; and as Christ was raised that he might be judge, so shall the dead be raised that they may be judged. As therefore God gave an assurance to all men that he would judge the world by that man, in that he raised him from the dead, so by the same act did he also give an assurance of the resurrection of the world to judgment.

Now as the General Resurrection is evidenced by the rising of Christ, so in a more especial and peculiar manner the Resurrection of the chosen Saints and Servants of God is demonstrated thereby. For he is risen not onely as their Lord and judge, but as their Head, to which they are united as members of his body (for he is the Head of the body the Church, who is the beginning of the first-born from the dead;) as the first-fruits, by which all the lump is sanctified and accepted, for now is Christ risen from the dead and become the first-fruits of them that slept. The Saints of God are endued with the Spirit of Christ, and thereby their bodies become the temples of the Holy Ghost; now as the promise of the Spirit was upon the Resurrection of Christ, so the gift and possession of the Spirit is an assurance of the Resurrection of a Christian. For if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead, dwell in us, he that raised Christ from the dead shall also quicken our mortall bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in us.

Thus God hath determined, and revealed that determination, to raise the dead, and confirmed that revelation by the actual raising of several persons as examples, and of Christ as the highest assurance which could be given unto man, that the doctrine of the Resurrection might be established beyond all possibility of contradiction. Wherefore I conclude that the Resurrection of the body, is in it self considered possible, upon general considerations highly probable, upon Christian principles infallibly certain.

But as it is necessary to a Resurrection that the flesh should rise, neither will the life of the soul alone continuing amount to the reviviscence of the whole man.

man, so it is also necessary that the same flesh should be raised again; for if either the same body should be joyned to another soul, or the same soul united to another body, it would not be the resurrection of the same man. Now the soul is so eminent a part of man, and by our Saviour's testimony not subject to mortality, that it never entred into the thoughts of any man to conceive that men should rise again with other souls. If the spirits of men departed live, as certainly they do, and when the Resurrection should be performed, the bodies should be informed with other souls; neither they who lived before then should revive, and those who live after the Resurrection should have never been before. Wherefore being at the latter day we expect not a new creation but a restitution, not a propagation but a renovation, not a production of new souls, but a reunion of such as before were separated, there is no question but the same souls should live the second life which have lived the first. Nor is this onely true of our souls, but must be also made good of our bodies, those houses of clay, those habitations of flesh: as our bodies while we live are really distinguished from all other creatures, as the body of every particular man is different from the bodies of all other men, as no other substance whatsoever is vitally united to the soul of that man whose body it is while he liveth, so no substance of any other creature, no body of any other man shall be vitally reunited unto the soul at the Resurrection.

That the same body, not any other, shall be raised to life, which died, that the same flesh which was separated from the soul at the day of death shall be united to the soul at the last day, that the same tabernacle which was dissolved shall be reared up again, that the same temple which was destroyed shall be re-built, is most apparent out of the same Word, most evident upon the same grounds upon which we believe there shall be any Resurrection. † *Though after my skin worms destroy this body, saith Job, yet in my flesh, (in flesh, shewing the reality, in my flesh, shewing the propriety and identity) shall I see God, whom I shall see for my self, and mine eyes shall behold, and not another, or a stranger, eye.* ^a *He that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken our mortal bodies;* after the Resurrection our glorified bodies shall become spiritual and incorruptible, but in the Resurrection of our mortal bodies, those bodies, by reason of whose mortality, we died, shall be revived. ^b *For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality.* But this corruptible and this mortal is the same bodie which dieth, because mortal, and is corrupted because corruptible; the soul then, at the resurrection of that man which is made immortal, must put on that body which putteth on incorruption and immortality.

† Job 19. 26.
27. Quid hac prophetia manifestius? nullus tam aperte post Christum, quam iste ante Christum de resurrectione loquitur, S. Hieron. Epist. 61.
^a Rom. 8. 11.
^b 1 Cor. 15. 53
ἵνα μὴ ἀλλοιωσῶμαι τῇ ὄντι καρὲς καὶ αἵματι βασιλείαν

Θεὸς ἡ κληρονομία, νομίσαι τὸ σῶμα μὴ ἀνίστασθαι, ἐπὶ γὰρ τὸ φθαρτὸν τὸ ἐνδύσασθαι ἀφθαρσίαν, καὶ τὸ θνητὸν τὸ ἐνδύσασθαι ἀθανάσιον, φθαρτὸν ὃ σῶμα, καὶ θνητὸν τὸ σῶμα. ὥστε τὸ μὴ σῶμα μὴ αὐτὸ γὰρ ὅτι τὸ ἐνδύσασθαι ἢ ὃ θνητότης καὶ ἢ ὃ φθορὰ ἀφανίζετο, ἀθανάσιος καὶ ἀφθαρτὸς ἐπέσθης αὐτῷ, S. Chrysost. ad locum. *Oegis τὴν ἀνελκείαν, τὸ θνητὸν τὸ ἐνδύσασθαι ἀθανάσιον, ἵνα μὴ ἄλλως νομίσθης σαρκὸς ἀνάστασιν, Theodoretus in id.* Oportet enim corruptivum istud induere incorruptionem, & mortale istud induere immortalitatem. Quid mortale nisi caro? quid corruptivum nisi sanguis? Ac ne putes aliquid aliud sentire Apostolum providentem tibi, & ut de carne dictum intelligas laborantem, cum dicit istud corruptivum & istud mortale curam ipsum tenens dicit. Certe istud nisi de subiecto, nisi de componenti pronuntiasse non potuit: demonstrationis corporalis est verbum, Tertull. de Resur. carnis, cap. 51. Sed & Apostolus cum dicit, Oportet enim corruptibile hoc induere incorruptionem, & mortale hoc induere immortalitatem: numquid non corpus suum quodammodo contingens & digito palantis est vox? Hoc ergo quod nunc corruptibile corpus est, resurrectionis gratia incorruptibile est, & nunc quod mortale est immortalitatis virtutibus induetur, Ruff. in Symb. Quod dicit Apostolus Corruptibile hoc & mortale; hoc ipsum corpus, id est, carnem, quæ tunc videbatur ostendit. Quod autem copulat, Inducere incorruptionem & immortalitatem; illud indumentum, id est, vestimentum, non dicit corpus abolere quod ornat in gloria, sed quod ante inglorium fuit efficere gloriosum, S. Hieron. Epist. 61. ad Pammachium.

The identity of the body raised from death is so necessary, that the very name of the Resurrection doth include or suppose it; so that when I say there shall be a Resurrection of the dead, I must intend thus much, that the bodies of men which lived and are dead shall revive and rise again. For at the death

† Πῦλ ὁ
σῶμα ἀνα-
στασις πῶς
ἢ σῶμα
ἐστὶ ἀνάστα-
σις, ὡς ἐδελό-
σθη ἱερεῖα,
Αὐτὴ δὲ ἡ ὁ-
νομασία ὁ
φθέρωνος δι-
κνυσὶ τὴν
δυναμιν.
Ἀνάστασις δὲ
ἢ κληροῖ ὅς
μὴ πεπρωκό-
τῃ πῶς
δὲ ἐστὶ τὸ πῶ-
σον; πῶς
τὸ πῶσον;

of man nothing † falleth but his body; the *spirit goeth upward*, and no other body falleth but his own; and therefore the body, and no other but that body, must rise again, to make a Resurrection. If we look upon it under the notion of Reviviscencie, which is more ordinary in the * Hebrew language, it proves as much; for nothing properly dieth but the body, the soul cannot be killed, and nothing can revive but that which dieth. Or to speak more punctually, The man falleth not in respect of his spirit but of his flesh, and therefore he cannot be said to rise again but in respect of his flesh which fell; man dieth not in reference to his soul, which is immortal, but his body; and therefore he cannot be said to revive, but in reference to his body before deprived of life; and because no other flesh fell at his death, no other body died but his own, therefore he cannot rise again but in his own flesh, he cannot revive again but in his own body.

πῶς τὸ λυθὲν, ἀλλ' ἢ τὸ σῶμα, ὡς ἢ ἡ ψυχὴ. ἡ ψυχὴ πῶς ἢ πῶς, ὅτε δὲ ἀνίστη, Epiphani. Her. 67. §. 6. Nam & ipsum quod Mortuorum Resurrectio dicitur exigit defendi proprietates vocabulorum. Mortuorum itaque vocabulo non est nisi quod amisit animam, de cuius facultate vivebat. Corpus est quod amittit animam, & amittendo fit mortuum; ita mortui vocabulum corpori comperit. Porro si Resurrectio mortui est, mortuum autem non aliud est quam corpus, corporis erit resurrectio. Sic & Resurrectionis vocabulum non aliam rem vendicat quam quæ cecidit. Surgere enim potest dici & quod omnino non cecidit, quod semper retro jacuit. Resurgere autem non est nisi ejus quod cecidit. Iterum enim surgendo quia cecidit resurgere dicitur. Re enim syllaba iterationi semper adhibetur, Tertull. adv. Marcion. lib. 5. cap. 9. Sed & ipsum Resurrectionis vocabulum significat non aliud ruere, aliud resuscitari; & quod adjicitur Mortuorum carnem propriam demonstrat; quod enim in homine moritur hoc & vivificatur, S. Hieronym. Epist. 61. Si id resurgere dicitur quod cadit, caro ergo nostra in veritate resurgit, sicut in veritate cadit, Gemmaus de Eccl. Dogm. cap. 6. Πῶς δὲ ἀνάστασις ἢ μὴ πεπρωκότα ψυχῇ; ἀνάστασις δὲ πῶς αὐτῆς κληροῖ ἢ μὴ πεπρωκότα ψυχῇ; πῶς δὲ τὸ πῶσον ἀνάστασις δὲ; πῶς ἢ ἡ ψυχὴ, ἀλλὰ σῶμα. ὅθεν ἢ δικαίως πῶς αὐτὸ ἢ (Cωμῆται) εἰσὶν κληροῖ. Epiph. l. 1. Her. 42. Ἀνάστασις δὲ (Cωμῆται) ἀναστήσονται. τὰ δὲ ἢ ἡ ἀνάστασις ἀναστήσονται δὲ ἢ ἀναστήσονται τὸ σῶμα δὲ ἐστὶ τὸ φθέρωνος ἢ ἀναστήσονται τὰ πῶς ἢ ἀναστήσονται εἰσὶν κληροῖ ἀνάστασις, ὅς δὲ δὴ ἀναστήσονται ψυχῇ δὲ ἀνάστασις, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὸ γινώσκω πῶς τὸ (Cωμῆται). Theodor. et Her. Fab. l. 5. c. 19. vide Iren. l. 5. c. 7. * The Rabbins use sometimes קומה, which is properly resurrection ἀνάστασις, according to that of our Saviour Talicha cumi: but more often they make use of חיות, which is reviviscencia ἀνάστασις. And though they make a distinction sometimes between them, attributing the first to the wicked, the second to the just, yet it must not so be understood as if there could be a Reviviscency without a Resurrection, a חיות without a קומה, but that there is to the wicked a קומה, which cannot so properly be called חיות, because they rise not to the happiness of eternal life.

Again, the description of the place from whence the Resurrection shall begin is a sufficient assurance that the same bodies which were dead shall revive and rise again. They which *sleep in the dust of the earth*, they which *are in the* † *graves* shall hear the voice and rise: *the sea shall give up the dead which are in it, and death and the grave deliver up the dead which are in them.* But if the same bodies did not rise, they which are in the dust should not revive; if God should give us any other bodies then our own, neither the Sea nor the Grave should give up their dead. That shall rise again which the Grave gives up; the Grave hath nothing else to give up but that body which was laid into it; therefore the same body which is buried at the last day shall be re-
vived.

Dan. 12. 2.
John 5. 28.
Rev. 20. 13.
† This Argu-
ment is so co-
gent, that the
Societians are
forced to de-
ny that Christ
spoke of the
Resurrection,
affirming that
the graves of
ignorance and impiety are only there intended, and rising is nothing else but coming to the knowledge of Christ by the preaching of the Go-
spel. whereas Christ expressly speaks of bringing men to judgment, v. 27. and divides those which are to come out of the graves into two
ranks, neither of which can be so understood. The first are those which have done good, before they come out of the graves; these there-
fore could not be the graves of ignorance and impiety, from which no good can come. The second are such who have done evil, and so
remain as evil-doers, and therefore cannot be said to have come forth out of the graves of ignorance and impiety, or to rise by the preaching
of the Gospel to newness of life, because they are expressly said to come forth unto the resurrection of damnation.

2 Cor. 5. 10.

The immediate consequent of the Resurrection proveth the identity of the dying and rising body, *We must all appear before the Judgment seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad.* That which shall be then received is either a reward or punishment, a reward for the good, a punishment for the evil, done in the body; that which shall receive the reward, and be liable to the punishment, is not only the soul but the body; it stands not therefore with the

the nature of a * just retribution, that he which sinned in one body should be punished in another, he which pleased God in his own flesh should see God with other eyes. As for the wicked, God shall ^a *destroy both their soul and body in hell*: but they which ^b *glorify God in their body and their spirit, which are God's*, shall be glorified by God in their body and their spirit, for they are both *bought* with the same price, even the blood of *Christ*. The bodies of the Saints are the ^c *members of Christ*, and no members of his shall remain in death: they are the *temples of the Holy Ghost*, and therefore if they be destroyed they shall be raised again. For if *the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in us*, as he doth, and by so dwelling maketh our bodies temples, ^d *he which raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken our mortal bodies, by his Spirit that dwelleth in us*.

* Quam absurdum, quam vero & iniquum, utrumque autem quam Deo indignum, aliam substantiam operari, aliam mercede dispensari, ac hæc quidem caro per martyria laesitur, alia vero coronetur: item & contrarium hæc quidem

caro in spurcitiis voluteur, alia vero damnetur? Nonne præstat omnem semel fidem à spe Resurrectionis abducere, quam de gravitate atque iustitia Dei ludere, Marcionem pro Valentino resuscitari? Tertull. de Resurrectione Carnis, cap. 56. *As speaking to the soul of man*, Affirmamus te manere post vitæ disputationem, & expectare diem iudicii, proque meritis aut cruciatui destinari aut refrigerio, utroque sempiterno. Quibus sustinendis necessario tibi substantiam pristinam ejusdemque hominis materiam & memoriam reverfuram, quod & nihil mali & boni sentire possis sine carnis passionis facultate, & nulla ratio sit iudicii sine ipsius exhibitione, qui meruit iudicii passionem. Id. de Testim. Animæ cap. 4. ^a Matt. 10. 28. ^b 1 Cor. 6. 20. ^c 1 Cor. 6. 15, 19. ^d Rom. 8. 11.

Furthermore, the identity of the dying and the rising body will appear by those bodies which shall never rise because they shall never die. This may be considered not onely in the ∴ Translations of *Enoch* and *Elias*, but also in those whom *Christ* shall find alive at his coming, whom he shall not kill but change; ^a *the dead in Christ shall rise first, then they which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air, and so shall ever be with the Lord*. If those which are alive shall be caught up as they are alive with the same bodies, onely changed into glorified and spiritual bodies, that is, with the same bodies spiritualized and glorified; certainly those which were dead shall rise out of their Graves to life in the same bodies in which they lived, that they may both appear alike before the *Judge of the quick and the dead*. Otherwise the Saints which shall be with God and with the Lamb for evermore would be checker'd with a strange disparity, one part of them appearing and continuing with the same bodies in which they lived, another part with others.

∴. Enoch translatus est in carne, Elias carnis rapus est in celum, necdum mortuus, & paradisi jam coloni habent quoque membra quibus rapti sunt atque translati, S. Hier. Epist. 61. ^a 1 Thess. 4. 16, 17.

Lastly, those examples which God hath been pleased to give us to confirm our faith in the Resurrection, do at the same time perswade us that the same body which died shall rise again. For whether we look upon the three Examples of the Old Testament, or those of the † New, they all rose in the same body before it was dissolved: if we look upon those which rose upon our Saviour's death; it is written, that ^a *the graves were opened, and many bodies of Saints which slept arose, and came out of their graves*, certainly the same bodies which were laid in. If then they were to us * examples of the Resurrection to come, as certainly they were, then must they resemble in their substance after they lived again the substance in which all the rest shall rise. And being *Christ* himself did raise his own body, according to his prediction, ^b *Destroy the Temple and in three days I will raise it up*, and declared it to be his own body, saying, ^c *Behold my hands and my feet that it is I myself*, being ^d *he shall change our vile bodies that they may be fashioned like unto his glorious body*, it followeth that we shall rise in the same bodies † as our Saviour did, that every particular person at the Resurrection may speak the words which *Christ* then spake, *Behold it is I myself*.

† Iren. l. 5. c. 13

^a Matt. 27. 52, 53.

* Post dicta Domini facta etiam ejus quid sapere credamus de capulis, de sepulchris mortuos resuscitantis? cui rei istud? si ad simplicitatem ostentationem potestatis, aut ad præsentem

gratiam redarumationis, non adeo magnum illi denuo morituros suscitare. Enimvero si ad fidem potius sequestrandum futuræ resurrectionis, ergo & illa corporalis præscribitur de documenti sui forma, Tertull. de Resur. carn. c. 38. At ego Deum malo decipere

cipere non posse, de fallacia solummodo infirmum; ne aliter documenta præmiſſe quam rem diſpoſuiſſe videatur, imo ne ſi exemplum reſurrectionis ſine carne non voluit inducere multo magis plenitudinem exempli in eadem ſubſtantia exhibere non poſſit. Nullum vero exemplum majus eſt eo cujus exemplum eſt. Majus eſt autem ſi animæ cum corpore reſuſcitabuntur in documentum ſine corpore reſurgendi, ut tota hominis ſalus dimidiæ parocinaretur; quando exemplorum conditio iſtud potius expeteret quod minus haberetur, animæ dico ſolius reſurrectionem, velut guſtum carnis reſurrectionis ſuo in tempore, *Ibid.* ^{John 2. 19.} ^{Luke 24. 39.} ^{Phil. 3. 21.} ¶ Expectamus in hujus morte & ſanguine emundatos remiſſionem peccatorum conſecuturos: reſuſcitandos nos ab eo in his corporibus, & in eadem carne qua nunc ſumus, ſicut & ipſe in eadem carne qua natus & paſſus & mortuus eſt reſurrexit. *So we read in the Creed which by ſome is attributed to Athanaſius, by others to Gregory Nazianzen.* Si ad exemplum Chriſti reſurgamus qui reſurrexit in carne, jam non ad exemplum Chriſti reſurgemus ſi non in carne & ipſi reſurgemus.

We can therefore no otherwiſe expound this Article, teaching the *Reſurrection of the body*, then by aſſerting that the bodies which have lived and died ſhall live again after death, and that the ſame fleſh which is corrupted ſhall be reſtored; whatſoever. ∴ alteration ſhall be made ſhall not be of their nature, but of their condition; not of their ſubſtance, but of their qualities. Which explication is moſt agreeable to the language of the Scriptures, to the Principles of Religion, to the conſtant Profeſſion of the Church, againſt the Originiſts of old, and the Socinians of late.

∴. Hæc eſt vera reſurrectionis conſeſſio quæ ſic gloriam carni tribuit ut non auferat veritatem, *S. Hieron. Epiſt. 61.*

Cum ergo ita evidens, & ut ita dicam palpabile, & manu atrectandum nobis Chriſtus dederit ſuæ Reſurrectionis exemplum, ita aliquis inſanit, ut aliter ſe reſurrecturum putet, quàm reſurrexerit ille qui primus Reſurrectionis aditum patefecit? *Ruff. Inveſtigat.* Noſtri autem illud quoque recogitant, corpora eadem recepturas in Reſurrectione animas in quibus deceſſerunt. *Tertull. de Animâ, cap. 56.*

Having hitherto proved the Certainty of this Article, that there ſhall be a *Reſurrection*, and declared the Verity and Propriety of it, that it ſhall be the *Reſurrection* of the ſame *body* which was dead; we may now proceed farther to enquire into the Latitude of the ſame, to whom the Reſurrection doth belong. And here we find a great difference between the Revelation of this truth under the Law and under the Goſpel; *Chriſt* proved out of the Law that there ſhould be a Reſurrection, but by ſuch an argument as reacheth no farther then unto the people of God, becauſe it is grounded upon thoſe words, *I am the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob.* *Job* ſpeaketh moſt expreſſly of the Reſurrection, but mentioneth no other then his Redeemer and himſelf. The place of *Daniel*, which was always accounted the moſt evident and uncontradicted testimony, though it deliver two different ſorts of perſons riſing, yet it ſeems to be with ſome limitation, *Many of them that ſleep in the duſt of the earth ſhall awake.* From whence the Jews moſt generally have believed that ſome men ſhall live again and ſome ſhould not; becauſe it is written, *Many ſhall awake*, but it is not written, *All ſhall awake.* Nay, ſome of them have gone ſo far by way of reſtriction, that they have maintained a Reſurrection of the Juſt alone, according to that ancient ſaying accepted amongſt them, that the ∴ *Sending of the Rain is of the juſt and unjuſt, but the Reſurrection of the dead is of the juſt alone.* Againſt which two Reſtrictions by the light delivered in the Goſpel we ſhall deliver the latitude of this Article in theſe two Propoſitions. Firſt, The Reſurrection of the dead belongeth not unto the juſt alone, but to the unjuſt alſo. Secondly, The Reſurrection of the dead belongeth not onely to ſome of the juſt, but to all the juſt, not to ſome of the unjuſt onely, but to all the unjuſt, even unto all the dead.

∴. This is recorded in the Berelhit Rabba. Vide Maimonidis Expl. 10. c. Traſſi. Sanhed.

For the firſt, it is moſt evident, not onely out of the New, but alſo out of the Old Teſtament. The words of *Daniel* prove it ſufficiently; for of thoſe many which ſhall awake, ſome ſhall riſe to everlaſting life, and ſome to ſhame and everlaſting contempt. But it is moſt certain that the juſt ſhall never riſe to ſhame and everlaſting contempt; therefore it is moſt evident

dent that some shall awake and rise beside the Just. The Jews themselves did understand and believe thus much, as appeareth by S. Paul's Apology to Felix, *But this I confess unto thee, that I have hope towards God, which they themselves also allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead both of the just and unjust.* The just shall rise to receive their reward, the unjust to receive their punishment; the first unto a Resurrection, called in reference unto them, *the resurrection of life*; the second unto a Resurrection, named in relation unto them, *the resurrection of damnation*. For as there is † a Resurrection of the just, so there must also be a Resurrection of the unjust: that as Christ said unto the charitable person, *Thou shalt be blessed, for thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the just*; so it may be said to the wicked and uncharitable, *thou shalt be accursed, for thou shalt be recompensed at the Resurrection of the unjust.* For there shall be a Resurrection that there may be a Judgment, and at the Judgment there shall appear sheep on the right hand of the Son of man, and goats on the left, therefore they both shall rise; those, that they may receive that blessing, *Come ye blessed of my Father, inherit the Kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world*: these, that they may receive that sentence, *Depart from me ye cursed into everlasting fire, prepared for the Devil and his Angels.* At that Resurrection then which we believe there shall rise both just and unjust.

Secondly, as no kind of men, so no person shall be excluded: whosoever dieth is numbred with the just or unjust. Adam the first of men shall rise, and all which come from him. For as in Adam all died, so in Christ shall all be made alive. Christ is the Lord of the dead, and so hath a right by that dominion to raise them all to life: it is called *the Resurrection of the dead* indefinitely, and comprehendeth them universally. By man came death, by man came the Resurrection of the dead, and so the Resurrection adequately answereth unto death. Christ shall destroy death, but if any one should be left still dead, death were not destroyed. The words of our Saviour are expresse and full, *The hour is coming in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth, they that have done good, unto the Resurrection of life, and they that have done evil, unto the Resurrection of damnation.* In the description of the Judgment which followeth upon the Resurrection, when the Son of man shall sit upon the Throne of his glory, it is said that, before him shall be gathered all nations. We shall all stand before the Judgment seat of Christ, and if so, the dead must all rise, for they are all fallen. We must all appear before the Judgment seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or evil; and before we all appear the dead must rise that they may appear. This is the latitude of the Resurrection; the Resurrection of the dead is the Resurrection of all the dead, or of † all mankind.

τὸ ἀναστῆναι πάντας τοὺς νεκροὺς, καὶ ἀναστῆναι πάντας τοὺς ἀνθρώπους. and Theophilus calls it ἀνάστασις ἀπάντων ἀνθρώπων. Ad Actol. h. 1.

Now this Resurrection, as an object of our faith, is yet to come; and we are obliged to believe the futurity of it. There were Hereticks in the Apostles dayes who acknowledged a Resurrection, but yet destroyed this Article, by denying the relation of it to the time, as *Hymeneus*

D d d

and

2 Tim. 2. 13. Nonnulli attendentes verba quæ apostolus dicit Apostolus, Quia & mortui sumus cum Christo, & resurreximus cum eo; nec intelligentes

quatenus dicatur, arbitrati sunt jam factam esse resurrectionem, nec ullam ulterius in fine temporum esse sperandam. Ex quibus est, inquit, Hymeneus & Philetus, qui circa veritatem aberraverunt, dicentes resurrectionem jam factam esse. Idem Apostolus eos arguens detectatur, qui tamen dicit nos resurrexisse cum Christo, S. August. Epistol. 119. ad Julianum. This was the Heresy of the Seleuciani or Hermiari, as the same S. Augustine testifies, Heref. 59. Resurrectionem non putant futuram, sed quotidie fieri in generatione filiorum. Thus Tertullian relates of some Hereticks in his time, who made the Resurrection wholly Allegorical, and yet pretended to believe a Resurrection in the flesh, but understood it in this life, at the Baptismal renovation, and so past when they professed to believe. Exinde ergo Resurrectionem fide consecutos cum Domino esse, cum eum in Baptismo iaduerint. Hæc denique ingenio etiam in colloquiis sæpe nostros decipere consueverunt, quasi & ipsi resurrectionem carnis admittant. Væ, inquit, qui non in hac carne resurrexit, ne statim illos percutiant, si resurrectionem statim, abnuent: tacite autem secundum conscientiam suam hoc sentiunt. Væ, qui non, dum in hac carne est, cognoverit arcana hæretica, hoc enim apud illos resurrectio, Tertull. de Resurrect. Carnis, cap. 19.

Now as we know the doctrine of the Resurrection was first delivered to be believed as to come; so we are assured that it is not yet come since the doctrine of it was first delivered, and is to be believed as to come to the end of the world; because, as Martha called it, it is the Resurrection at the last day. Job who knew that his Redeemer lived, did not expect that he should stand upon the earth till the latter day; Christ hath no otherwise declared his Fathers will, then that of all which he hath given him, he should lose nothing, but should raise it up at the last day. The Corn is sown and laid in the ground, and the Harvest is the end of the world. We must not expect to rise from the dead till the last trump. The Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of an Archangel and with the trump of God before all that are in the graves shall hear his voice. God shall judge the world, and therefore shall raise the world: but he will not raise them to that judgment till the end of the world.

Thus having demonstrated that the will of God hath been revealed that there should be a Resurrection; that the Resurrection which was revealed is the Resurrection of the body; that the bodies which are to be raised are the same which are already dead or shall hereafter die, that this Resurrection is not past, but that we which live shall hereafter attain unto it; I conceive I have declared all which is necessary by way of explication and confirmation of the truth of this Article.

The Value of this Truth, the Necessity of this Doctrine will appear; First, in the illustration of the Glory of God, by the most lively demonstration of his Wisdom, Power, Justice, and Mercy. God first created all things for himself, and the Resurrection is as it were a new Creation. The Wisdom and power of God are manifested in this acknowledgment, in as much as without infinite knowledge he could not have an exact and distinct comprehension of all the particles and individual dusts of all the bodies of all men; and without an infinite power he could not conjoin, cement, conglutinate and incorporate them again into the same flesh. The Mercy and Justice of God are declared by the same profession; the Mercy, in promising life after that death which we had so justly deserved; the Justice, in performing that promise unto all true believers, and in punishing

ing the disobedient with everlasting flames. *When ye see this, saith the Prophet, your hearts shall rejoyce, and your bones shall flourish like an herb; and the hand of the Lord shall be known towards his servants, and his indignation towards his enemies.* 14. 66. 14.

Secondly, it is necessary to profess the belief of *the Resurrection of the body*, that we may thereby acknowledge the great and powerfull work of our Redemption; confessing that death could not be conquered but by death, and that we could never have obtained another life had not the Saviour of the World *abolished death and brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel.* If *Christ* were not the Life, the dead could never live: if he were not the Resurrection they could never rise. Were it not for him *that liveth and was dead and is alive for evermore*, had not he *the keys of hell and of death*, we could never break through the barrs of death, or pass the gates of hell. But he hath undertaken to vanquish our enemies, and our *last enemy to be destroyed is death*: that the prophesie may be fulfilled, *Death is swallowed up in victory*, and we may cry out with the Apostle, *Thanks be to God, who giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ.* 2 Tim. 1. 10.
Hos. 13. 14.
1 Cor. 15. 54, 57.

Thirdly, the Belief of this Article is necessary to strengthen us against the fear of our own death, and immoderate sorrow for the death of others. The sentence of death passed upon us for our sins cannot affright and amaze us, except we look upon the suspension, relaxation, or revocation of it in the Resurrection; but when we are assured of a life after death, and such a life as no death shall follow it, we may lay down our fears arising from corrupted nature upon the comforts proceeding from our Faith. The departure of our friends might over-whelm us with grief, if they were lost for ever; but the Apostle will not have us ignorant concerning those which are asleep, *that we sorrow not even as others which have no hope.* 1 Thess. 4. 13.

Fourthly, the belief of the Resurrection hath a necessary reflexion upon this life by way of preparation for the next, as deterring from sin, as encouraging to holiness, as comforting in afflictions. How can any man commit a deliberate sin while he thinks that he must rise and stand before the Judgement seat, and give an account, and suffer for ever the punishment due unto it? What pleasure can entice him, what inclination can betray him for a momentary satisfaction to incurr an eternall rejection? How can we defile that body which shall never be raised to glory hereafter except it here become the Temple of the Holy Ghost? Saint Paul who hath delivered the doctrine, hath taught us by his own example what work is expected to be wrought upon our souls by it. *I have hope, saith he, towards God that there shall be a Resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust. And herein do I exercise my self to have alwayes a conscience void of offence toward God and toward man.* This is the proper work of a true belief and a full persuasion of a Resurrection; and he which is really possessed with this hope, cannot chuse but purifie himself; *always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as he knoweth that his labour is not in vain in the Lord.* This encourageth all drooping spirits, this sustaineth all fainting hearts, this sweetneth all present miseries, this lightneth all heavy burdens, this encourageth in all dangers, this supporteth in all calamities. Acts 24. 15, 16.
1 Cor. 15. 58.

Having thus discovered the truth of this Article; we may easily perceive what every man is obliged to believe, and understood to profess,

when he confesseth a belief of *the Resurrection of the body*; for thereby he is conceived to declare thus much, I am fully persuaded of this as of a most necessary and infallible truth, that as it is appointed for all men once to die, so it is also determined that all men shall rise from death, that the souls separated from our bodies are in the hand of God and live, that the bodies dissolved into dust, or scattered into ashes, shall be recollected in themselves and reunited to their souls, that the same flesh which lived before shall be revived, that the same numerical bodies which did fall shall rise, that this resuscitation shall be universal, no man excepted, no flesh left in the grave, that all the just shall be raised to a resurrection of life, and all the unjust to a resurrection of damnation, that this shall be performed at the last day when the Trump shall sound; and thus *I believe the Resurrection of the body.*

ARTICLE

ARTICLE XII.

And the Life Everlasting.

THis last Article though † not to be found in all, yet was expressed in
 * many ancient Creeds: in some by way of addition, *and the life ever-
 lasting*; in others by way of conjunction with the former, *the Resurrection of
 the body unto everlasting life*. Upon this connexion with the former will
 follow the true Interpretation of this concluding Article; for thereby we
 are perswaded to look upon it as containing the state of man after the Refur-
 rection in the world to come.

† Not in all;
for divers en-
ded with that
of the Resur-
rection, as ap-
peareth by
Ruffinus, who
not onely ex-
pounded the
Aquileian
Creed, but

collated it with the Greek and Roman, and yet makes no mention of this Article ; but concludes with that of the Resurrection. Sed & ultimus iste sermo, qui resurrectionem carnis pronunciat, summam totius perfectionis succincta brevitate concludit. And whereas he shews the custome of the Aqueleian Choyce to make a cross upon their forehead at the naming of hujus carnis , he tells us elsewhere, in his Apology against S. Hierome, that it was to conclude the Creed. Quo scilicet fronte, ut mos est in fine Symboli, signaculo contingentes, & ore carnis hujus, videlicet quam coniungimus, resurrectionem facientes, omnem venenatæ adversum nos lingue calumniandi aditus præstruemus. In the same manner S. Hierome his contemporary, In Symbolo fidei & spei nostræ, quod ab Apostolis traditum non scribitur in chartâ & atramento, sed in tabulis cordis carnalibus, post confessionem Trinitatis & Unitatem Ecclesiæ omne Christiani dogmatis sacramentum carnis resurrectione concluditur, Epist. 61. So S. Chrysostom. Hom. 40. in Cor. p. 514. Μελέν γὰρ τὴν πλῆθιν ἀπαγγελίας ὅτις μυστικὸν ρημάτων κίνησον ἐκαστὼν καὶ τοὺς οὐρανίους καὶ τὸν θεόν· κατεστειμένον δὲ τὸν στήθος σου μετὰ ταύτης βαπτίσαντος, λαλοῦντες λόγον ἐπὶ παντός αὐτοῖς καὶ ψαλλόμενοι ἀναψαλλον, εὐδοκεῖτε τῇ πίστει ταύτη βαπτισθέντες· μὴ γάρ ποτε ὑμετέωσανται οὗτοι μετ' ὧν ἄλληλων, τότε καθιδέομαι ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν ὑμῶν νουμάτων κινήων. So Maximus Turinensis after these words Carnis Resurrectionem, adds, Hic Religionis nostre finis, hæc summa credendi est. And Venantius Fortunatus after the same words, summa perfectionis concluditur. And in the Ms. set forth by the Archbishop of Armagh Καρὸς ἀνάστασις and carnis resurrectione are the last words. * As Petrus Cerylogus

the Archbishop of Armagh *Cyprianus Andronicus* and carnis resurrectione are the last words. As Petrus Chrysologus expressly, Credis vitam eternam, quia post resurrectionem nec bonorum finis est nec malorum. Signate vos, Serm. 6. and again, Bene addidit vitam eternam, ut se resurrectionem crederet qui resurgeret per ipsam qui cum Deo Patre & Spiritu S. vivat & regnat. So *Etherius taxamensis*, and *Eusebius Gallicanus*. So we find Serm. de Tempore 131. & De Symbolo ad Catech. lib. 1. Quomodo carnis Resurrectionem? Ne forte periret aliquis quomodo Lazari, ut scias non sic effles, additum est in vitam eternam; and l. 2. Hoc sequitur etiam in S. Symbolo, quod post Resurrectionem carnis credamus & vitam eternam; lib.3. and lib.4. Hoc sequitur in S. Symbolo quod omnia quæ credamus & speramus in Vita æterna percipiamus. And *Carolus magnus* in his *Reprehensionibus* of *Basilii Bishop of Ancyra*. Non eo modo præjudicat prætermisio imaginum adorationis sacre fidei puritati, quæ interdici potius quam instituta est; sicut præjudicat Remissio peccatorum, carnis Resurrectio, & Vita futuræ sæculi, si in confessione prætermittantur; quæ utique & in omni scripturam ferie prædicantur, & ab Apostolis in Symbolo laudabili brevitate connexæ tenentur, *Capitul. lib. 3. cap. 6.* *Anonymous* in Homilia sacra fere forth by *Elmebostius with Gennadius*. Post illam abrenunciationem nos interrogat à Sacerdotibus, Credis in Deum omnipotentem, creatorem celi & terre? unicusquisque respondit, Credo. Credis in & Dominum Christum filium ejus unicum, Dominum natum ex Mariæ Virgine, passum & sepultum? & respondit, Credo. Tertia interrogatio, Credis & in Spiritum S. Sanctam Ecclesiam Catholicam, Sanctorum communionem, resurrectionem peccatorum, carnis resurrectionem, & vitam eternam? & respondit unusquisque nostrum, Credo.

As therefore *S. Paul* hath taught us to express our belief of a *Resurrection both of the just and the unjust*, so after the Resurrection we are to consider the condition of them both, of the one as risen to everlasting life, of the other as risen to everlasting punishment and contempt, and so those who first acknowledged this Article † did interpret it. Although therefore *Life everlasting*, as it is used in the Scriptures, belongeth to the just alone, and is never mentioned otherwise then as a reward promised and given to them who fear and serve the Lord, yet the same words may be used to express the duration of any persons which live never to die again, whatsoever their state and condition in it self shall be. For as the *Resurrection of the dead* is taken in the Scriptures for the happy and eternal condition which followeth after it, as when the Apostle saith, *∴ If by any means I might attain unto the Resurrection of the dead*; which he must needs be most certain to

† As appear-
eth by those
words of
Chrysologus,
Credimus vi-
tam æternam,
quia post Re-
surrectionem
nec bonorum
finis est nec
malorum.
∴ Phil. 3. 11.

not barely ἀνάστασις, but ἐξανάστασις, ἐς τὴν ἐξανάστασιν ἢ νεκρῶν · and in the *Alexandrian Ms.* ἐς τὴν ἐξανάστασιν τῶν ἐκ νεκρῶν, which is the most ancient reading, as appears by the *Vulgar Translation*, Si modo occurrām in resurrectionem quæ est ex mortuis, and the reading of *Tertullian*, Si qua concurrām in resurrectionem quæ est à mortuis, and the *Syriac Tran-*

station, לקימתה דמן בירי מיתה, yet the ἐξανάστασις, of it self, was taken for no more then ἀνάστασις by any of the Translators. And S. Chrysostom did so understand it, as appeareth by these words upon the place, Εἰπωσ καλῶς τῶν, εἰς τὴν ἐξανάστασιν τῶν ἐν νεκρῶν (which is the reading of the Alexandrian Ms.) τί λέγεις; καὶ μὴ πάντες αὐτῆς τυγχάνουσιν, καὶ ἐν ἀνάστασις μόνως, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀφθαρσίας πάντες, οἱ μὲν εἰς τιμὴν, οἱ δὲ εἰς ἐρόδιον καλῶσιν. Εἰ τίγυν πάντες τὴν ἀνάστασιν τυγχάνουσιν, καὶ ἐν ἀνάστασις μόνως, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀφθαρσίας, πᾶς ὡς μέλλων ἐξαίρετον πρὸς τυγχάνειν ἔλεγε, εἰ πᾶς κατὰ τὴν αἰώνιον; By which it appeareth that S. Chrysostom took no notice of the word ἐξανάστασις, or of the phrase ἐν ἐστὶ νεκρῶν, but as the interpretation of the Apostles intention addeth, πᾶσαν ἐνδοξασαν ἀνάστασιν αὐτοῖς; τὴν αὖτις αὐτῶν ἀγῶνιστον τὸν Χριστόν. So also Theodoretus paraphrase, ἵνα μεταβῶ καὶ ἐν ἀνάστασις. It is therefore I conceive a Notion peculiar to Theophylact among the Greeks, Πάντες ἀνίστανται, καὶ μὴ πάντες ἐξίστανται.

attain unto, who believed the Resurrection of the just and unjust, and therefore if he had spoken of the Resurrection in general, as it belongeth unto all, he needed not that expression, *If by any means*, nor that which went before, *the fellowship of Christ's sufferings*, for without them he should certainly rise from the dead; but he meant that Resurrection which followeth upon the being *made conformable unto his death*, which is a Resurrection in conformity to the Resurrection of *Christ*. As, I say, the Resurrection of the dead is taken in the Scripture for everlasting happiness, and yet the same language is and may be used for the general Resurrection of all men, even of of such as shall be everlastingly unhappy; † so *the Life everlasting*, though used for a Reward given onely unto the Elect, may yet be taken as comprehending the condition of the Reprobate also, understood barely for the duration of persons living.

All those then who shall rise from the dead shall rise to life, and after the Resurrection live by a true vital union of their souls unto their bodies: and because that union shall never cease, because the parts united shall never be dissolved, because it is *appointed for men once to die*, and after their revivency never to die again, it followeth that the life which they shall live, must be an *everlasting life*.

To begin then with the Resurrection to condemnation; the Truth included in this Article in reference unto that, is to this effect, that those who die in their sins and shall be raised to life, that they may appear before the Judgment seat of *Christ*, and shall there receive the sentence of condemnation, shall be continued in that life for ever to undergoe the punishment due unto their sins; in which two particulars are contained, the duration of their persons, and of their pains. For two wayes this Eternity may be denied; one, by a destruction or annihilation of their persons, with which the torments must likewise cease; the other, by a suspension or relaxion of the punishment, and a preservation of the persons, never to suffer the same pains again. Both of which are repugnant to the clear revelations of the Justice of God against the disobedience of man.

Our first Assertion therefore is, that the Wicked after the day of Judgement shall not be consumed or annihilated, but shall remain alive in soul and body to endure the torments to be inflicted upon them by the justice of God, for all the sins committed by them while they were in the body. They who of late oppose the eternal subsistence and misery of the wicked, strangely maintain their Opinion not as a position to be proved by reason, as some of the * Heathens did, but as a truth delivered in the Scriptures, as if the Word it self taught nothing but an annihilation of the enemies of God, and no lasting torment; as if all the threats and menaces of the justice and wrath of God were nothing else but what the scoffing Atheist expects, that is, after death never to be again, or if they be, as it were in a moment to lose that being for ever. Because the Scripture speaks

† Sed sciendū enim quia omnes boni & mali resurgere habent ad vitam, sed non omnes resurgent ad gloriam. Ruffin. ad Psal. I.

* Μαζοι δὲ ἀδανᾶτοι οὖτος ἀλγῶν δὲ κατὰ νους, ἐπὶ τῷ πᾶσι τῷ ἀλγῶν δὲ τῷ ἐστὶν. S. Em. pyricus ad. Mathem. p. 321.

speaks of them as of such as shall be destroyed, and perish, and die; therefore they will give that comfort to them here, that though their life in which they sin be short, yet the time in which they are to be tormented for their sins shall be shorter far. They tell us where the Scripture mentioneth destruction in Hell, it speaks of perdition, but no torment there. In this sense will they understand those words of *Christ*, (so full of terror in the true, so full of comfort to the wicked, in their exposition,) *Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell.* If this place speak, as those men would have it, of perdition onely, not of cruciation; then will it follow that God is not able to cruciate and torment a man hell; for there can be no other reason why it must be spoken of perdition onely excluding cruciation, but because he is able to annihilate, not to cruciate. No, certainly a man may be said to be destroyed, and perish, to be lost, and dead, who is rejected, separated and disjoyned from God the better and the nobler life of man; and that person so denominated may still subsist, and be what in his own nature he was before, and live the life which doth consist in the vital union of his soul and body, and so subsisting undergo the wrath of God for ever. Nor shall any language, phrases or expressions give any comfort to the wicked, or strength to this Opinion, if the same Scriptures, which say the wicked shall be destroyed, and perish, and die, say also that they shall be tormented with never dying pains, as they plainly and frequently doe.

Depart from me ye cursed, shall the Judge eternal say to all the Reprobate, *into everlasting fire*; and lest any should imagine that the fire shall be eternal, but the torments not; it followeth, *and these shall goe away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal.* Now, if the fire be everlasting by which God punisheth the Reprobates, if the punishment inflicted be also everlasting, then must the Reprobates everlastingly subsist to endure that punishment, otherwise there would be a punishment inflicted and none endured, which is a contradiction. Nay the *life eternal* may as well be affirmed to have an end, as *the everlasting punishment*, because they are both delivered in the † same expression.

damnati: & quibuscunque dixerit, *Venite benedicti Patris mei*, hi semper percipiunt regnum, & in eo proficiunt semper. † Καὶ ὁ ἀπολόγουτος ἐπὶ τοῖς κόλασιν αἰώνιον, οἱ δὲ σῶντες εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον. Matt. 25. 46. Antiquus ille Persuasor in membris suis, id est, in mentibus iniquorum futuras penas quasi certo fine determinat, ut eorum correptiones extendar, & eo magis hic peccata non finiant, qui istie affirmant peccatorum supplicia finienda. Sane enim nunc etiam qui idcirco peccatis suis ponere finem negligunt, quia habere quandoque finem futura super se judicia suspicantur. Quibus breviter respondemus, si quandoque finienda sunt supplicia reprobatorum, quandoque finienda sunt & gaudia beatorum; per semetipsam enim Veritas dicit, *Ibunt hi in supplicium eternum, iusti autem in vitam eternam.* Si igitur hoc verum non est quod minatus est, neque est illud verum quod promissit. S. Gregor. Moral. lib. 34. cap. 11. Affirmamus te (Anima) manere post vitæ disunctionem, & expectare diem Judicii, proque meritis, aut cruciatibus destinari, aut refrigerio utroque sempiterno. Tertull. de Testim. Animæ. Deus itaque judicabit plenius, quia extremius, per sententiam æternam tam supplicii quam refrigerii. Tertull. de Animæ, cap. 33. Qui producto ævo isto judicaturus sit suos cultores in vitæ æternæ retributionem; profanos in ignem æque perpetuæ & jugem, suscitatis omnibus ab initio defunctis ad utriusque meriti disjunctionem. Apolog. c. 18.

Indeed the eternity of that fire prepared for the Devil and his Angels is a sufficient demonstration of the eternity of such as suffer in it, and the question onely can be what that eternity doth signifie. For, because some things are called in the Scriptures eternal which have but a limited or determined duration, therefore some may imagine the fire of Hell to be in that sense eternal, as lasting to the time appointed by God for the duration of it. But as the Fire is termed eternal, so that eternity is described as absolute, excluding all limits, prescinding from all determinations. The end of the burning of fire is by extinguishing, and that which cannot be extinguished

Mat. 10. 28.
Locus Mat.
thæi 10. 28.
perditionem
tantum ani-
mæ in gehē-
na, non cru-
ciatum de-
nunciat,
Smalcus cor-
tra Meisne-
rum. Igni æ-
terno illi
Christi ho-
stes qui qui-
dem sunt Di-
abolus & An-
geli ejus (vel
saltem quo-
rum nomine
isti quoque
continentur)
cum impiis
cruciabun-
tur, & ita
delebuntur:
Croll. Comm.
in 1 Cor. c. 15.
a Matt. 25.
41, 46. Irenæ.
l. 4. c. 47. Qui-
buscunque e-
nim dixerit
Dominus,
Discedite à
me maledicti
in ignem per-
petuum, isti
erunt semper

Matt. 3. 12.
Luke 3. 17.
Matt. 18. 2.

* Tertull. de
Pœnitentiâ,

c. 12. Quid
illiam thesau-
rum ignis
æterni æsti-
mamus, quum
fumaricola
quædam ejus
rales flamma-
rum ictus
fufcitant, ut
proximæ ur-
bes aut jam
nullæ extant
aut idem sibi
de die spe-
rent? Diffi-
cilius super-
biffimi mon-
tes ignis in-
trinfecus fœ-
tu, & quod
nobis judicii
perpetuita-
tem probat
cum diffili-
ant cum de-
vorentur,
nunquam tamen finiantur.

ἵνα μάταιοι ἀπελθόντων ἐν τῷ κέλευθῳ ἡς ἀβύσσου, ὡς καὶ ἐν τῇ διχαίᾳ τρυφῶν αἰώνιον. Andreas Cesar ad locum.

* Revel. 14. 11.

† Eis aîōna ὃ αἰώνων αὐτὸν ἀναβαίνειν λέγεται, ὡς καὶ ἐν τῇ διχαίᾳ τρυφῶν αἰώνιον. Andreas Cesar ad locum.

Revel. 20. 10.

Revel. 4. 8. 7. 15.

guished can never end; but such is the fire which shall torment the Repro-
bate; for he, whose *fan is in his hand, shall burn up the chaff with unquench-
able fire*; and hath taught us before, that *it is better to enter into life halt
or maimed, rather than having two hands or two feet to be cast into everlasting
fire, to goe into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched*; and hath far-
ther yet explained himself by that unquestionable addition, and undeniable
description of the place of torments, *Where the worm dieth not, * and the
fire is not quenched*. And that we may be yet farther assured that this fire
shall be never extinguished, we reade that *the ^a smook of their torment ascen-
deth up for ever and ever †*, and that those which are ^b *cast into the lake of fire
and brimstone, shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever*: which ex-
pression of *day and night* is the same with that which declareth the eternal
happines in the heavens, where ^c *They rest not day and night, saying, Holy,
holy, holy: where they are before the throne of God, and serve him day and
night in his Temple*. If then the fire in which the Reprobates are to be tor-
mented; be everlasting, if so absolutely everlasting that it shall never be
quenched, if so certainly never to be quenched, that the smook thereof
shall ascend for ever and ever, if those which are cast into it shall
be tormented for ever and ever (all which the Scriptures expressly
teach) then shall the wicked never be so consumed as to be annihilated,
but shall subsist for ever, and be coeternal to the tormenting flames. And
so this language of the Scriptures proves not onely an effect eternal, as an-
nihilation may be conceived, but an eternal efficient never ceasing to pro-
duce the same effect, which cannot be annihilation, but cruciation onely.
And therefore the fire which consumed *Sodom and Gomorrah*, bears no
proportion with the flames of Hell: because all men know that fire is ex-
tinguished, nor doth the smook thereof ascend for ever and ever.

Rev. 2. 11.

Neither doth this onely prove the eternity of infernal pains, but clear-
ly refute the onely material Argument brought against it, which is laid upon
this ground, that the Wicked after the Resurrection shall be punished with
death, and that a second death, and so they shall be no more, nor can in
any sense be said to live or subsist. For, the enduring of this fire is that
very death, and they are therefore said to die the second death because
they endure eternal torments. *He that overcometh shall not be hurt by the se-
cond death*; it seems that they which shall die that death shall be hurt by it,
whereas if it were annihilation, and so a conclusion of their torments, it
would be no way hurtfull or injurious, but highly beneficial to them. But
the living torments are the second death. *For death and Hell were cast in-
to the lake of fire, this is the second death. Whosoever was not found writ-
ten in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire, this is the second death*.
The Jews before our Saviour's time believed there was a second death, and
though it were not expressed in the Oracles themselves which were commit-
ted to them, yet in the received † Exposition of them it was often mentio-
ned, and that as the punishment of the wicked in the life to come; and

† The Chaldeæ
Paraphrase
maketh often
mention of it,

as Deut. 33. 6. Let Reuben live and not die, he expoundeth thus, **יחי ראובן בחי עולמה ומיתה תנינא לה**, Let Reuben live in life of the World, and not die the second death. So the Targum of Onkelos. The Jerusalem Targ more expressly, **יחי ראובן בעלמא הדיון ולא ימות במותנה תנינא רבה מיתין רשעין לעלמא ראתי**, Let Reuben live in this world, and let him not die the second death, which the wicked die in the world to come. So Isa. 22. 14. Surely this iniquity shall not be purged from you till ye die. **אם ישתכח חבא הדיון לכוין עד די תמותין**, I will not keep silence but will recompense, even recompense into their bosome. **לא אתן להן**

I will
 לָהֶם אֲרַא כְּחַיֵּי אֱלֹהִים אֲשֶׁלֶם לָהֶם פְּרָעוֹנֹת הַדְּבָרוֹן וְאַסְמֹד לְמוֹתָא תְּנִינֵית נְיוּיִין
 nor give them an end in this life, but will recompense them with vengeance for their sins, and deliver their bodies to
 the second death. From these and the like places it appears that the Jews believed that the wicked after death should be delivered
 to a second death; that this death should be in the world to come; that they should by this death be punished for their sins, and S. John
 revealed that this punishment shall be by everlasting burnings. Κεῖ δὲ αἰῶνες ὅ ἀνάστατος τοῦ οὐ τοῦ Ἰ Καρπὸς αἰωνίου· ὁ
 ὃς τὸ ἀνίσταται ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐκπαύσεται· ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι αἰῶνι, ὅσα καὶ εἴδη ἢ τὰ πνεύματα γενοῦνται. Andreas Celsar.
 in Apocal.

what this punishment shall be, was in these words revealed to S. John, *Revel. xix.*
But the fearful and unbelieving, and the abominable and murderers and whore-
mongers and sorcerers and Idolaters, and all liars shall have their part in the
lake which burneth with fire and brimstone, which is the second death. Now if
the part in the lake be the second death, if that part be a perpetual per-
manion in torment, as before is proved; then to say that the wicked shall
die the second death is not a confutation of their eternal being in misery,
but an assertion of it, because it is the same thing with everlasting torments,
but delivered in other terms.

And if the pretence of death will not prove an annihilation, or infer a conclusion of torment, much less will the bare phrases of *perdition* and *destruction*; for we may as well conclude that whosoever says he is * *undone*, intends thereby that he shall be no more: beside, the eternity of destruction in the language of the Scripture signifies a perpetual perdition and duration in misery. For when *Christ* shall come to *take vengeance on them that know not God, and obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ*, they shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power. Wherefore I conclude that the wicked shall rise to everlasting punishment, continuing both in soul and body under the wrath of God and the torments proceeding from it, never to be quitted of them by annihilation; which is our first Assertion, against the * covert Doctrine of the Socinian.

red by Socinus, and some of his brethren did profess themselves to be scandalized at it, though he thought he had so delivered it that it should sooner be believed by his writings than perceived in them, as appeareth out of his sixth Epistle to Volkelius, who was offended at this doctrine, and seems never to have assented to it. Quod ais in Disputatione mea cum Puccio tum de Christianorum resurrectione tum de morte impiorum passim contineri, quæ multis hic magna offensione, tum nostris tum alienis, legi non possint; scio equidem ista ibi contineri, sed meo iudicio, non passim nec ita aperte (cavi enim istud quantum potui) ut quisquam vir pius facile offendi possit; adeo ut quod nominatim attinet ad impiorum mortem, in quo dogmare majus est multo offensionis periculum, ea potius ex iis colligi possit quæ ibi disputantur, quam expresse literis consignata extet, adeo ut Lector, qui aliqui sententiam meam adversus Puccium de mortalitate primi hominis, quæ toto libro agitur, quæq; ob non paucos quos habet fautores, parum aut nihil offensionis parere potest probandum censeat, prius censeat doctrinam istam sibi jam perfunctam esse quam suaderi animadvertat. Against this Germanus Patriarch of Constantinople in his defence of Gregory Nyssene, shewes from the words of Christ, the Apostles, Prophets, and the Fathers, ὡς τὸ ἀγαπᾶν τὴν ψὴν δικαιοσύνην ἀντιτάλπει τὴν ψάλασιν, ὥτ' ἡ τὴν ψὴν ἀνίστασθαι ἀπὸ τῶν νεκρῶν καὶ ἀνίστασθαι πάλιν. Pötsius Cod. 233.

The second Assertion teacheth us that as the Reprobates shall never fail to endure the torments due unto their sins, so the Justices of God will never fail to inflict those torments for their sins. They shall never live to pay the uttermost farthing, they shall never come to the days of refreshment who are cast into perpetual burnings. One part of their misery is the horror of despair, and it were not perfect Hell if any hope could lodge in it. The favour of God is not to be obtained where there is no means left to obtain it; but in the world to come there is no place for faith, nor virtue in repentance. If there be now such a vast distance between the tormenting flames and *Abraham's* bosom, that none could pass from one to other; what impossibility must there be when the final sentence is past upon all. As certainly as no person once received into the heavenly mansions shall ever be cast into outer darkness, so certainly none which is once cast into the fire prepared for the Devil and his Angels, shall ever enter into their Masters joy. As the tree fal-

leth so it lieth : there is no change to be wrought in man within those flames, no purgation of his sin, no sanctification of his nature, no justification of his person, and therefore no salvation of him. Without the mediation of *Christ* no man shall ever enter into heaven, and when he hath *delivered up the Kingdom to God even the Father*, then shall the office of the Mediator cease.

So groundless was the opinion of *Origen*, who conceived that after some number of years the damned should be released from their torments, and made partakers of the joys of heaven, or at least trie their fortunes in such Regions of the World, as he conceived should be reserved for their habitation. For he may as well imagine that *Christ* shall be born and die again, (who being risen *dieth not*) as that any person being condemned to the flames for contemning of his death, should ever come to live again, and by believing in the death of *Christ*, to be after saved. For certainly their condition is unalterable, their condemnation is irreverfible, their torments inevitable, their miseries eternal. As they shall not be taken from their punishment by annihilation of themselves, which is our first; so the punishment shall not be taken off them by any compassion upon them, which is our second Assertion.

To conclude this branch of the Article, I conceive these certain and infallible doctrines in Christianity. That the wicked after this life shall be punished for their sins, so that in their punishment there shall be a demonstration of the Justice of God revealed against all unrighteousness of men. That to this end they shall be raised again to life, and shall be judged and condemned by *Christ*, and delivered up under the curse to be tormented with the Devil and his Angels. That the punishment which shall be inflicted on them shall be proportionate to their sins, as a recompense of their demerits, so that no man shall suffer more then he hath deserved. That they shall be tormented with a pain of loss, the loss from God, from whose presence they are cast out, the pain from themselves, in a despair of enjoying him, and regret for losing him. That they farther shall be tormented with the pain of sense inflicted on them by the wrath of God which abideth upon them, represented unto us by a lake of fire. That their persons shall continue for ever in this remediless condition, under an everlasting pain of loss, because there is no hope of heaven, under an eternal pain of sense, because there is no means to appease the wrath of God which abideth on them. Thus the Athanasian Creed, *They that have done good shall go into life everlasting, and they that have done evil into everlasting fire.*

The next Relation of this Article to the former is in reference to the Resurrection of the Just; and then *the life everlasting* is not to be taken † in a vulgar and ordinary sense, but raised to the constant language of the Scriptures, in which it signifieth all which God hath promised, which *Christ* hath purchased, and with which man shall be rewarded in the world to come.

† Eam quippe vitam eternam dicimus, ubi est sine fine felicitas. Nam si anima in pœnis vivit æternis,

quibus & ipsi spiritus cruciabuntur immundi, mors illa potius æterna dicenda est, quam vita. Nulla quippe major & pejor est mors quam ubi non moritur mors. *S. Aug. de Civit. Dei, l. 6. c. 12.* Quia *vita æterna* ab his qui familiaritatem non habent cum Scripturis Sanctis potest accipi etiam malorum vita; vel secundum quosdam etiam Philosophos, propter animæ immortalitatem; vel etiam secundum fidem nostram, propter pœnas interminabiles impiorum, qui utique in æternum cruciari non poterunt nisi etiam vixerint in æternum; profecto finis Civitatis hujus, in quo summum habebit bonum, vel pax in vita æterna, vel vita æterna in pace dicendus est, ut facilius ab omnibus possit intelligi. *Ibidem l. 19. c. 11.*

Now this life eternal may be looked upon under three considerations; as Initial, as Partial, and as Perfectional. I call that Eternal Life *Initial*, which

which is obtained in this life, and is as it were an earnest of that which is to follow; of which our Saviour spake, *He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death unto life.* I call that *Partial*, which belongeth though to the nobler, yet but a part of man, that is the soul of the just separated from the body. I dispute not whether the joys be partial as to the soul, I am sure they are but partial as to the man. For that life consisteth in the happiness which is conferred on the Soul departed in the fear, and admitted to the presence, of God. S. Paul had a desire to depart and to be with Christ; he was willing rather to travail and be absent from the body, and to be present and at home with the Lord: and certainly where S. Paul desired to be when he departed, there he then was, and there now is, and that not alone, but with all them which ever departed in the same faith with him, and that is, with Christ who sitteth at the right hand of God. This happiness which the Saints enjoy between the hour of their death and the last day, is the *Partial* life eternal. Thirdly, I call that *Perfectional* which shall be conferred upon the Elect immediately after the blessing pronounced by Christ, *Come ye blessed children of my Father, Receive the Kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world.*

This *Eternal* life is to be considered in the Possession, and in the Durations; in the first, as it is *Life*, in the second, as it is *Eternal*. Now this life is not onely natural, that is the union of the soul to the body, which is the life of the Reprobate; but spiritual, which consisteth in the * union of the soul to God, as our Saviour speaks, *He that hath the Son hath life, and he that hath not the Son hath not life.* And it is called after an especial manner *Life*, because of the † happiness which attendeth it: and therefore to understand that life, is to know, so far as it is revealed, in what that happiness doth consist.

* *Dux vite sunt una corporis, altera animæ; sicur vita corporis anima, ita vita animæ Deus. Quomodo si anima defecit, moritur*

corpus; sic anima moritur, si defecerat Deus. S. Aug. in Psal. 70.

† 1 John 3. 12.

† For Life is taken for

happiness, and to live for being happy. As among the Greeks and Latines *Zēn* and *Vivere* were taken for living a cheerful and a merry life, as *Vivamus mea Lesbia, in Catullus* and in *Martial*. *Sera nimis vita est crastina, vive hodie*, and as it is in an *Old Inscription*, *AMICI DUM VIVIMUS VIVAMUS*, and in the convivial wish, *Ζήστω*, mentioned by *Dio* in the life of *Commodus*; So in the language of the Scriptures and a religious notion they signifie an happy and a blessed life, As 1 Sam. 10. 24. *יהי המלך חַי*, Let the King live, is translated by the Chaldee Paraphrast, *יְצַל מַלְכָּה*, Let the King prosper. And when *David* sent unto *Nabal*, he said, Thus shall ye say to him that liveth in prosperity, which is in the Original nothing but *יהי*. So the Psalmist is to be understood, Psal. 69. 32. The humble shall see this and be glad, and your heart shall live that seek God. And S. Paul 1 Thess. 3. 8. *ἵνα ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ἐν Κυρίῳ*. Thus Life of it self is often taken in the Scriptures for a happy and glorious life, even that which is eternal, as S. Austin observeth upon these words of the 119 Psalm. *Veniant mihi miserationes tuæ & vivam*]. Tune enim vere vivam, quando nihil potero timere ne moriar. Ipsa enim & sine ullo additamento dicitur *Vita*, nec intelligitur nisi æterna & beata, tanquam sola dicenda sit vita, in cujus comparatione ista quam ducimus, mors potius sit appellando quam vita: quale illud est in Evangelio, *Si vis venire ad vitam, serva mandata*. Nunquid addidit, æternam vel beatam? Item de resurrectione carnis cum loqueretur, *Qui benefecerunt, inquit, in resurrectionem vitæ*. Neque hic ait, æternæ vel beatæ. Sic & hic, *Veniant, inquit, mihi miserationes tuæ, & vivam*: Neque hic ait, in æternum vivam, vel beate vivam; quasi aliud non sit vivere quam sine ullo fine, & sine ulla miseria vivere: thus S. Austin; and again *Enchir. ad Laurentium, c. 92.* Non est vera vita, nisi ubi feliciter vivitur, nec vera incorruptio, nisi ubi salus nullo dolore corrumpitur.

To begin with that which is most intelligible; the bodies of the Saints after the Resurrection shall be transformed into spiritual and incorruptible bodies. The flesh is sown in corruption, raised in incorruption, sown in dishonour, raised in glory, sown in weakness, raised in power, sown a natural body, raised a spiritual body. This perfective alteration shall be made by the Son of God, who shall change our vile body that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself. Thus when we come into that other world, the world of Spirits, even our bodies shall be spiritual.

As for the better part of man, the Soul, it shall be highly exalted to the utmost perfection in all the parts or faculties thereof. The understanding shall be

E e e 2

raised

1 Cor. 13.12. raised to the utmost capacity, and that capacity completely filled. Now we see through a glass darkly, but then face to face; now we know but in part, but then shall we know even as also we are known. And this even now we know, that when God shall appear we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is. Our first temptation was that we should be like unto God in knowledge, and by that we fell; but being raised by *Christ* we come to be truly like him, by knowing him as we are known, and by seeing him as he is. Our wills shall be perfected with absolute and indefective holiness, with exact conformity to the will of God, and perfect liberty from all servitude of sin. They shall be troubled with no doubtful choice, but with their † radical and fundamental freedom shall fully embrace the greatest good. Our affections shall be all set right by an unalterable regulation, and in that regularity shall receive absolute satisfaction; and all this shall be effected that we may be thereby made capable, and then happy by a full fruition.

† Sicut prima immortalitas fuit quam peccando Adam perdidit, posse non mori, novissima erit non posse mori, ita primum liberum arbitrium, posse non peccare, novissimum non posse peccare. Sic enim erit inamissibilis voluntas pietatis & aequitatis quomodo est felicitatis. Nam utique peccando nec pietatem nec felicitatem tenuimus, voluntatem vero felicitatis nec perditam felicitatem perdidimus. Certe Deus ipse numquid quia peccare non potest ideo liberum arbitrium habere negandus est? Erit ergo illius Civitatis & una in omnibus & inseparabilis in singulis voluntas libera, ab omni malo liberata, & impleta omni bono, fruens indeficienter æternorum jucunditate gaudiorum, oblita culparum, oblita poenarum, nec tamen ideo suæ liberationis oblita, ut liberatori suo non sit ingrata. S. Aug. de Civit. Dei, l. 22. c. 30. v. eundem Tractatu de Epicuri & Stoicis, prope finem.

To this internal perfection is added a proportionately happy condition, consisting in an absolute freedom from all pain, misery, labour, and want; an impossibility of sinning and offending God; an hereditary possession of all good, with an unspeakable complacency and joy flowing from it, and all this redounding from the vision and fruition of God; This is the *Life*.

And now the *Duration* of this life is as necessary as the life it self, because to make all already mentioned amount unto a true felicity, there must be added an absolute security of the enjoyment, void of all fear of losing it or being deprived of it, And this is added, to complete our happiness, by the adjection of Eternity. Now that this life shall be eternal we are assured who have not yet obtained it, and they much more who do enjoy it. He which hath purchased it for us and promised it unto us, often calleth it *eternal life*; it is described as a *continuing city*, as *everlasting habitations*, as an *house eternal in the heavens*; it is expressed by *eternal glory*, *eternal salvation*, by an *eternal inheritance*, *incorruptible*, *undefiled*, and *that fadeth not away*, by the *everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ*. And lest we should be discouraged by any short or lame interpretation of eternity, it is further explained in such terms as are liable to no mistake. For our Saviour hath said, *If any man keep my saying he shall never see death*. And, *whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall not die*. When God shall wipe away all tears from our eyes there shall be no more death; and where there is life and no death, there must be everlasting life. Which is expressed by S. Paul by way of opposition, calling it *life and immortality*, and that together with the abolition of death, saying that *our Saviour Jesus Christ hath abolished death and hath brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel*.

The belief of this Article is necessary, (as to the eternity of torment,) to deter us from committing sin, and to quicken us to holiness of life and a speedy repentance for sin committed. For, *the wages of sin is death*; nothing can bring us to those everlasting flames but sin, no sin but that which is unrepented of; nothing can save that man from the never-dying worm, who dieth in his sins; and no other reason can bring him thither, but because he sinned

Heb 13.14.
Luke 16.9.
2 Cor. 5.1.
1 Pet. 5.10.
Heb. 5. 9.
9.15.
1 Pet. 1.4.
2 Pet. 1.11.
John 3.5.1.
11.26.
Rev. 21.4.

2 Tim. 1.10.

sinned and repented not. † They which imagine the pains inflicted for sin to be either small or short, have but a slender motive to innocence or repentance; but such as firmly believe them sharp, and endless, have by virtue of that faith within themselves a proper and natural spur and incitement to avoid them: for *who can dwell in everlasting burnings?*

† Tertull. Apol. c. 45. recounting the advantages of the Christians towards innocence and holiness of life

which the Heathens had not. Recogitate etiam pro brevitate supplicii cujuscunque, non tamen ultra mortem remanenti. Sic & Epicurus omnem cruciatum doloremque de pretiis, modicum quidem contemptibilem pronuntiando, magnum vero non diuturnum. Enimvero nos qui sub Deo omnium speculatore dispungimur quique æternam ab eo poenam providemus, merito soli innocentie occurrimus, & pro scientie plenitudine, & pro latebrarum difficultate, & pro magnitudine cruciatibus, non diuturni sed sempiterni, cum timentes quem timere debet & ipse qui timentes judicat, Deum non Proconsulem timentes.

Secondly, the belief of eternal pains after death is necessary to breed in us a fear and awe of the great God, a jealous God, a consuming fire, a God that will not be mocked; and to teach us to tremble at his word, to consider the infinity of his Justice, and the fierceness of his wrath, to meditate on the power of his menaces, the validity of his threats, to follow that direction, to embrace that reduplicated advice of our Saviour, *I will forewarn you whom ye shall fear; Fear him which, after he hath killed, hath power to cast into hell; yea, I say unto you, Fear him.* And that exclusively of such fear as concerns the greatest pains of this life; which the ∴ Martyrs undervalued out of a belief of eternal torments.

Luke 12. 50

Thirdly, this belief is necessary to teach us to make a fit estimate of the price of *Christ's* blood, to value sufficiently the work of our Redemption, to acknowledge and admire the love of God to us in *Christ*. For he which believeth not the eternity of torments to come, can never sufficiently value that ransom by which we were redeemed from them, or be proportionately thankfull to his Redeemer by whose intervention we have escaped them. Whereas he who is sensible of the loss of Heaven, and the everlasting privation of the presence of God, of the torments of fire, the company of the Devil and his Angels, the joys of the wrath of an angry and never to be appeased God, and hopeth to escape all these by virtue of the death of his Redeemer, cannot but highly value the price of that blood, and be proportionably thankfull for so plenteous a Redemption.

∴ So Polycarpus the Martyr answered the Proconsul threatening to consume him with fire. Ἰδε ἀπειλὴς τοῦ αἰεὶς ζῆγον καὶ ἀθάτον σθεναρῶς. Ἀγνοεῖς γὰρ τὸ ὅτι μελλόντος χριστοῦ καὶ εὐαγγελιστοῦ καὶ ἀποστόλου τοῦ ἀποστόλου τῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς ἐκκλησίας. Epist. Smyrn. Eccl.

Again, as this Article followeth upon the Resurrection of the just, and containeth in it an eternal duration of infinite felicity belonging to them, it is necessary to stir us up to an earnest desire of the Kingdom of heaven and that righteousness to which such a life is promised. *I will now turn aside, and see this great sight,* said *Moses*, when he saw the burning bush. *It is good for us to be here,* said *S. Peter*, when he saw our Saviour transfigured in the Mount; how much more ought we to be enflamed with a desire of the joys of heaven, and that * length of days which onely satisfieth by its eternity, to a careful and constant performance of those commands to which such a reward is so graciously promised! For as all our happiness proceedeth from the vision of God, so we are certain that without holiness no man shall see him.

* So S. Austin upon those words, Longitudine dierum replebo eum] in the

91 Psalm. Quæ est longitudo dierum? vita æterna est. Fratres, nolite putare longitudinem dierum dici, sicut sunt hyeme minores, æstate dies majores. Tales dies nobis habet dare? Longitudo illa est quæ non habet finem, æterna vita quæ nobis promittitur in diebus longis. Et vere quia sufficit non sine causa dixit, replebo eum. Non nobis sufficit quicquid longum est in tempore si habet finem, & ideo nec longum dicendum est. Et si avari sumus, vitæ æternæ debemus esse avari: talem vitam desiderare quæ non habet finem. Ecce ubi extendatur avaritia vestra. Argentum vis sine fine? Vitam æternam desidera sine fine. Non vis ut habeat finem possessio tua? Vitam æternam desidera.


Secondly, this belief is necessary to take off our inclinations and desires from the pleasures and profits of this life; to breed in us a † contempt of the

† Nemo vitam æternam, incorruptibilem immortalemque desiderat, nisi cum vitæ hujus temporalis, corruptibilis, mortalisque poeniteat. S. Aug. Hom. 50.

Col. 3. 2, 3. world, and to teach us to despise all things on this side heaven; to *set our*
 Matt. 6. 21. *affections on things above, not on things on the earth*, considering we *are dead,*
 Phil. 3. 13, 14 *and our life is hid with Christ in God.* For *where our treasure is, there will our*
hearts be also. Therefore we must *forget those things which are behind, and*
reaching forth unto those things which are before, press toward the mark, for
the price of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus.

Thirdly, an Assent unto this Truth is necessary to encourage us to take up
 the Cross of *Christ*, and to support us under it; willingly and cheerfully to
 undergo the afflictions and tribulations of this life, *reckoning* with the Apo-
 stle, *that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the*
 Rom. 8. 18. *glory which shall be revealed in us;* and knowing that our *light affliction, which*
 2 Cor. 4. 17-18. *is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of*
glory: and this knowledge is not to be obtained, this comfort is not to be
 expected, except we *look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which*
are not seen; for the things which are seen are temporal, but the things which are
 not seen are eternal.

And now having thus shewed the propriety, proved the verity, and de-
 clared the necessity of this Article, we may fully instruct every Christian
 how to express his belief in the last object of his faith, which he may most fitly
 thus pronounce: I do fully and freely assent unto this as unto a most necessa-
 ry and infallible truth, that the unjust after their Resurrection and Condem-
 nation shall be tormented for their sins in hell, and shall so be continued
 in torments for ever, so as neither the Justice of God shall ever cease to in-
 flict them, nor the persons of the wicked cease to subsist and suffer them:
 and that the Just after their Resurrection and Absolution shall as the blessed
 of the Father obtain the Inheritance, and as the servants of God enter into
 their Masters joy, freed from all possibility of death, sin and sorrow, filled
 with all conceivable and inconceivable fulness of happiness, confirmed in an
 absolute security of an eternal enjoyment, and so they shall continue with
 God and with the Lamb for evermore. And thus I believe *the Life ever-*
lasting.

FINIS. 

Cataphrygians 158
 Elandrian Anabaptists 161
 Eutychians 162
 Nestorians 163
 Socinians 166
 Arian 167
 Apollinarians 187, 237
 Valentinians 145
 Basilideans 202
 Aquilean Creed 226
 Roman Creed 227
 Aramian Council 328
 Orléans 328
 Montanus's Heresy 329
 Donatists 344
 Novatians 345, 369
 African Creed 351
 Macchus Laurinensis 351
 Greek Creed 351
 Old Latin Creed 351
 Marcellus 351
 Arius's 351
 Jerusalem Creed 351
 Constantinopolitan 351